Megan: Oh, there we go. All right, so we’re going to start with some important announcements from the VAIRRS Team. The IRB information sheet with our completion rate is slowly climbing. We wanted to thank everyone for their efforts in ensuring the investigator community is aware of and completes the wizard.

We are currently revising the IRB information sheet to improve clarity and response options. We will be sending around those updates about the revisions here shortly.

The VAIRRS Mentor Program, we have selected and reached out to the first round of our mentor and mentees. If you were not selected for this round, please note that you may be paired in the future. We will be still accepting applications throughout the year and you can access those applications via the VAIRRS Mentor Program SharePoint page and the link is included on this slide.

As for VAIRRS University, we are excited to present a brand new feature—the content navigation column that includes a breakdown of the research investigator and administrator’s perspective recordings by topics and allows users to jump to a specific time in the presentation recording.

Additionally, users can now navigate through the training energizers by topic and page number making information more easily acceptable.

Finally, if you have not already subscribed to our newsletter, the link is included on this slide, and you can keep up with those important updates, and program announcements such as the revisions for the IRB information sheet wizard.

With that, I will get started on the presentation.

Angela Foster: Good afternoon, everyone and thank you for joining the VAIRRS monthly webinar series. Today, we will discuss the proper utilization of the research administration workspace.

My name is Angela Foster. I’m the VAIRRS Program Manager and I will be leading our discussion today. Next slide please.

The objectives for today’s webinar are to review the purpose and features of the admin workspace, proper utilization of the workspace and we’ll also have a demonstration at the end to go through all of the steps that we discuss. The demo will be followed by a Q & A session. Next slide please.

The research administration workspace—or admin workspace as you’ll hear me call it throughout the presentation—was provided to each side when onboarded to IRB. The admin workspace is the primary submission workspace for investigators.

When the investigators go to submit a package, they don’t see their committee workspaces. For the initial submission, they would only see the research administration workspace.

The admin workspace is where the initial triage of the package should occur and also the administration pre-review before that package gets forwarded to a committee workspace.

The gatekeeper is the primary role functioning in the admin workspace. The term “gatekeeper” is used because this role serves as the initial receiver of submissions and determines the routing pathway of the package.

Depending on the volume of submissions at your site, the gatekeeper role may be filled by one person or multiple individuals in your research office. At a minimum, we suggest that one person and a backup be assigned to the gatekeeper role.

If you are not utilizing your admin workspace, we encourage you to consider the benefits of doing so, conducting the triage of admin review in the admin workspace to certainly improve the quality of the submission before it reaches the committee workspace, as well as the other benefits that we’ve listed on this slide. Next slide please.

The features of the admin workspace are similar to those in the committee workspaces. Types and agenda dates are available to organize your submission, assign to various members of the Research Office for Action, and label submissions with special characteristics.

For example, if you have multiple committee administrators in your research office, a dummy agenda date can be created for each administrator. As packages are submitted, the gatekeeper can assign the package to the appropriate administrator using that administrator’s agenda date.

A tag can also be used to label packages for routing, identify packages at an external committee, or other special characteristics. Again, the admin workspace can be used to triage packages before forwarding to the committee workspace.

One of the benefits of triaging in the admin workspace is if the package needs to be unlocked and corrected for any reason, all of this can be done before the package reaches the committee’s workspace.

An additional feature of the admin workspace is the ISSO and PO review or designations. That’s your Information Security Officer and Privacy Officer. Using the special designations will provide a richer detail in both your local insight reports and on the VAIRRS dashboards. If that review or special designation is used, we can actually report on the number of reviews conducted by an ISSO/PO. The turnaround time for those would be used, etc.

The diagram on the slide is intended to illustrate the submission and routing of a package through your gatekeeper or through your admin workspace. The initial package is submitted by the study team to the admin workspace. There may be some back and forth for the study team before that package is ready to be forwarded for institution reviews or for committee review.

Again, you’ll see the bubble. That reflects the admin workspace in the bidirectional arrow between the study team and then you’ll also see the one-way arrow that goes out to your ISSO/PO and to your committee workspace. Next slide please.

Now we’ll go through each of the steps that we just highlighted in detail. Next slide please.

Upon receipt of a submission, the first step in the admin workspace is to apply the appropriate tags. If this submission is a subsequent submission like a Dash Two package, or Dash Three, or higher and global tags have already been applied to the project. A gatekeeper would need to take note of those tags as they may help with the assignment or routing of the package.

Flags are assigned by picking the T icon which is located next to the project title. A single tag can be applied to the package or a global tag can be assigned to the entire project.

The tags are specific to the admin workspace and they will not carry over to your committee workspaces. The tag library is custom to your site and can be as expensive as needed. Next slide please.

The attended dates can not only be used to assign packages, but it also keeps your unassigned keys organized and allow for filtering. We’ll go into more detail when we get to the demonstration. Next slide please.

The Completeness Check is the next step. We have called it the Administrative Pre-Review. It’s called Triage, but it’s really the step where you do your initial review of the package. Conducting the pre-review in the admin workspace allows the study team to make any corrections to the package before it reaches the committee’s workspace.

We recommend that any unlocking be done before the package is shared with committee members for review. If a committee member requests a revision, it’s suggested that the study team be instructed to submit a revision or follow-up package.

This is especially critical when the package has been submitted to more than one committee workspace. As once the package is unlocked in one workspace, it is unlocked in all workspaces.

So, again, conducting your pre-review—the Administrative Pre-Review in the admin workspace before it’s forwarded to a committee’s workspace really keeps all of that locking and unlocking contained in the admin workspace and it doesn’t have to occur in your committee’s workspace.

Again, that’s especially critical if you’re doing parallel reviews and you submitted it to IRB and Safety. If it’s unlocked in IRB, it will be unlocked in Safety as well. Next slide please.

Once your pre-review is complete, the package can be shared with your institutional reviewers as such as your ISSO and your PO. Again, conducting their institutional reviews in the admin workspace allows you to use those reviewer designations specifically for ISSO and PO. Next slide please.

The next to final step is recording the appropriate board action. The actions that are appropriate for your admin workspace and the use case for each action are listed in the table.

The most widely used action, of course, is forwarded and that should be used once your package is submitted or forwarded to a committee workspace. The most widely used review type is administrative review.

The project status review and date bills are available just like they are shown in the committee workspaces. But it’s not necessary to record an active project status or, or expiration, or approval dates in the admin workspace because it’s not a committee workspace. The project dates and status should be tracked in the appropriate committee workspace or RNDC workspace. Next slide please.

The final step in the admin workspace is to submit the package to the appropriate committee. For linear reviews, the package would be submitted to the first subcommittee and from there onto the next until it reaches RNDC. For parallel reviews, the package can be submitted to multiple committee workspaces and those reviews can be conducted at the same time.

All right, so now we’ll move on to the next slide. For this, we’re going to perform a demonstration of the suggested steps in the admin workspace. The final spot in the deck includes references for all of the information provided today and you can review that at your leisure.

So, now we’ll move over to our Sandbox environment where we will conduct our demonstration.

(Long pause)

Okay, so now we’re in Sandbox environment. For my Sandbox, it’s the Sunnydale VA Research Administration. Each of you or each site has its own Sandbox environment that is accessible to you. If you don’t have the credentials for that environment, you can check with your power user or your IRB contact in the Research Office and they should have the credentials.

I’m currently logged in as a Committee Administrator. This is my submission manager and as you can see, I’m currently looking at my unsigned submissions that are awaiting a board action.

I have 28 submissions that are pending review. There’s no organization. There’s no agenda dates assigned. So, it’s really just a long list of submissions.

So, the first thing that I’m going to do is create two dummy agenda dates. For the sake of our experiment or our demonstration today, we’re going to pretend that we have two administrators in our Research Office.

The first dummy agenda date I’ll just pick a random date—something that is obviously not an actual agenda date. I’m going to go out as far as I can and just do April One.

For my meeting location, I’m going to assign this to Brenda Administrator. I’ll save that date.

My second date, I’ll add another date. I’ll go out as far as I can and we’ll do October. We’ll assign to Angie Administrator.

Okay, so now we have our two dummy agenda dates in the admin workspace. I’ll go back to my Submission Manager.

Now I want to create three tags and these tags will be used to organize and label my submissions. So, the first tag I will just use RNDC only and we’ll keep that light in color.

My second tag I’ll choose external IRB and we will assign blue. My last tag I’ll just use IRB exempt and we will assign this red.

Okay, so now we have our three tags. We’ll go back to our Submission Manager. Even though we have 28 pending submissions, we’re going to work with these first three that show up in our list.

So, for the three packages that we’re working with today, the first thing I want to do is assign to the appropriate administrator. So, for this new project I’m going to assign this to Angie Administrator.

We’ll go back and now we have two showing up. The second I’ll assign to Brenda. Okay, and we’ll go back again. We’ll work with this third one and we’ll assign this one to Brenda as well.

All right, so now if I want to save all of Angie’s pending actions, I’ll go to Angie’s agenda. There’s the one package that’s assigned to Angie Administrator.

For this package, I will assign a global tag and we will just label this one “External IRB”.

Now you see one in a bubble here. One turns on the tag for the particular submission. If you choose the bubble, it’s the global tag and that turns it on for the project. So, every time a submission comes in to the admin workspace under this project, that tag will automatically show up.

Now for Package One, we’re going to open the package and conduct our two hours (SP) of the package. We immediately see that there’s something missing. There’s no protocol.

So, the first thing we’re going to do is unlock this package and we’re going to send a note to the study team letting them know that they need to submit a protocol. Instead of submit I’m going to say, “Please upload the protocol and lock package.” All right, so now you can see that that package is currently unlocked and waiting for the study team’s action.

So, we’ll go back to our Submission Manager. Now let’s go and step into Brenda’s shoes. You can see Brenda now has two packages waiting for her action.

So, let’s go into our first package. It’s \_\_\_\_\_ [00:18:55] and we can review documents. We can look at any training and credentials that were submitted. If there is any status of the COI, that would show in our project team tracking.

From here, what we’re going to do is assign this package for ISSO and PO review. Now every Sandbox, there is no ISSO and PO special designation. I had asked IRB Net to correct this, but at the time of the webinar it’s still not showing.

If you go into your local Sandbox, you should see in the admin workspace the ISSO and PO reviewer designations. So, for the sake of our demo today, we’re just going to pretend that they are appearing and we’ll use those to assign.

We’re also going to assign a date that the review is due and we’ll set some bells here. One bell will show me an alert when Abby has conducted her review. Two bells will show me an alert when all reviewers have conducted their reviews.

(Long pause)

We also want to select our Notify Users, so that they get a message letting them know that their access has been granted for this particular package. Again, the ISSO and PO reviewers are not showing under our special designation.

So, we’re going to use our imaginations today and pretend that those designations were made. We will select “Save” and we can go back to our Submission Manager. You see here the icons that show it has been shared with members for review and that a review due date has been assigned.

Now we’ll open our next package. Let me go back to the Submission Manager really quickly because one thing I did not do was assigning tags.

So, for this we will assign IRB Exempt and that’s to the pockets that’s been sent out for ISSO and PO review. For our next package, we’ll assign RNDC only.

So, let’s open our RNDC only package. In our imagination, we are going through and conducting our pre-review. All of the required documents have been uploaded. Training and credentials is available. The project team tracking is showing that the COIs are complete and that’s only if it’s applicable and that your site is using the COI monitor.

We don’t need to share this with any committee members at this time. But what we do want to do—because this package is ready to go onto the committee—is record a board action. That board action for this particular package, we’re going to record administrative review and that the package is going to be forwarded. That’s forwarded onto RNDC on our effective date. We’ll save and exit.

We see that that board action is now showing the effective date that we’re going to submit the package on to the RNDC. I’ll select RNDC from my board dropdown, continue. I don’t need to change the submission type. If you have a practice on your site of including comments, you would include those in this box and submit.

So, now that package has gone on to RNDC Review. It’s no longer showing in my queue. I don’t have any further action for that package.

For this package, again, this is the IRB exempt package. It has been assigned to the ISSO and PO. We can say for the purpose of our demonstration that those reviews are complete. If in fact, they had been completed, there would be a nice red checkmark over our calendar to show that they were complete.

So, what I want you to see with this package, it’s very similar to this step I just complete. Only we’ll be sending this on to a different committee.

So, I will record my administrative review. My action is forwarded and my effective date. I save that action and then I will submit this package on. For this, we’ll say it’s on IBC. Continue and submit.

Here it’s showing that board action has been recorded. If I go back to my submission manager, it’s nice and clean. I don’t have anything pending. I don’t have anything that’s already been acted upon showing up. I can unclick this box that says, “Only show submissions awaiting board action” and I can see now those two packages that we just completed.

Again, if I only want to see things that are pending a board action, in this case instead of the board action it’s technically my administrator’s action. I would just turn that box back on and my queue is nice and clean again.

So, that was Brenda’s perspective. Now we want to go back to Angie’s perspective. If you remember, there was a package there that needed a protocol to be uploaded. That package was unlocked and pending the study team’s action.

So, what I can do really quickly is login as an investigator. I’m doing this in the background, so you won’t see it on your particular screen share. However, as investigator, I can go in, and correct the mistake in the package, and relock the package.

So, let’s just say that that step had been done. I’ll go back in and lock it. I’m doing this as an administrator, but in the real life scenario the investigator would lock once they completed their chances. By the investigator locking it, it would notify the administrator that those changes had been complete.

Now that the package is completed, the protocol has been uploaded and the package is ready to go on for review. So, just by the previous two examples, we sent one on to RNDC. We sent one on to IBC.

For this package, we’re going to do the same. We’re going to record our administrative review. We’re going to label it as forwarded. We’re going to record an effective date.

For this example, we’ll send it on to SLA. Again, you would include your comments there. That’s your local practice and we can see that that board action is reported.

Now as Angie, if I go back to my queue, it’s nice and clean. There’s nothing showing that’s pending. If I unclick my Submissions Awaiting Board Action, we can see there is that one package that’s already been processed. It’s not waiting for any further action on the study team or for the administrator. It is essentially complete in the admin workspace.

So, that was the demonstration. We showed you how to create and assign tags. We displayed how to create the dummy agenda dates and assign those, how they can be used for assigning out to various staff members for their actions.

We went through how to unlock in the admin workspace and how to forward from the admin workspace on to the subcommittee or the RNDC for review. That concludes the demonstration.

At this time, I’m going to stop sharing and we can move into our Q & A.

(Long pause)

Porter: Megan, do you have another recording or should we jump over to questions?

Megan: Nope. We can jump over to questions now.

Porter: Perfect.

(Long pause)

Angela Foster: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Angie. Thank you for your patience. We tried a new format with a pre-recorded webinar, but the Q & A is live. I just wanted to let everyone know that we are here to answer your questions.

All right, so the first question, “Is a requirement for the ISSO and PO used to be one in the admin space. I typically have those done in my IRD space.”

So, what we presented today is a suggested practice. There’s no mandate that states that the ISSO and PO reviews be conducted in the admin space at this time. But it is the suggested workspace for those institutional with the committee.

(Long pause)

“Can you please provide more details on how ISSO and PO can be used and uploaded in IRB Net?”

So, the PO and ISSO reviews are conducted just as any committee member would conduct the review. The first step is to make sure the two roles—ISSO and PO—have been added as a committee member in the appropriate workspace. You can assign packages to them using that review designation and assigned due dates just as if you would to any other committee member.

(Long pause)

“We have a bunch of committees, and admin staff, and many signatures coming in every day. What is the benefit doing the pre-review in Research Admin and not in the particular committee space?”

It can be quite complex and researchers responses to unlock instructions can take days which means hundreds of signatures for multiple committees can be sitting in such admin workspace.

So, the first thing is that the admin workspace—as we discussed—can be organized using your dummy dates and/or tags. This would prevent that long list of submissions just sitting in the queue.

The user side suggests you conduct the admin meetings in the admin workspace as to minimize the need for unlocking when you want to teach the committee workspace.

(Long pause)

Okay. I think we already answered that. “What happens when ISSO and PO review is done when a package is sent to the committee? Does this mean the timing of their reviews are not checked?”

So, the timing of all reviews—regardless of the workspace where that review is conducted is tracked within the system. The date that it is assigned to a reviewer, the date that it is marked complete by a reviewer, all of that is tracked within the system.

What’s the next question? “When I globally tag a subject as duplicate, do other subcommittees see that tag? Does the study team see that tag?”

So, the answer to both are no. The tag that is applied within any workspace is only viewable within that particular workspace. The study team does not see any of the activity that goes on in the workspace. They do not see the tags that you apply to a package.

(Long pause)

“The same exact thing can be done in any committee space as far as organization, right?”

Yes, that is correct.

“Is there a particular benefit to not unlocking packages in a committee workspace? Is there some sort of tracking going on as to how long packages remain unlocked?”

The answer to that portion of the question is yes. The system tracks every time a package is unlocked, the number of times a package is unlocked and how long that package remains unlocked. So, all of that information is being tracked in the system.

(Long pause)

“For packages that are reviewed by multiple committees, would you unlock the package for staff to upload completed checklists or add those completed checklists as board documents which can be viewed by everyone? I’m thinking of initial submissions which may eventually go to the RNDC who need to confirm that all prior reviews have been completed.”

So, it is my suggestion that a reviewer worksheet, you upload it to the reviewer section as a reviewer document. If there’s a need to public a document as a board document, then you do have that capability. But it is by far the suggestion that any reviewer documents be uploaded to the reviewer workspace.

(Long pause)

Okay. “What is the COI module? I know what COI is, but what is the IRB Net C1 module? Do all sites have that?”

So, the IRB Net COI module was released last year in the fall, I believe. It is a conflict of interest module. It is accessible by investigators. Your site must elect to use that module in order for your investigators to have access to it.

You do need to name your local COI administrator who would also have access to that workspace and be able to do their reviews within the COI workspace. If necessary, forward a COI submission onto OTC Ethics Board (SP) for \_\_\_\_\_ [00:35:55].

But again, your site must elect to use that module. You would do so by having your IRB Net put in contact. Submit that email to IRB Net support.

(Long pause)

“IRB Net seems to send out a lot of email when the package moves out of the admin workspace. It often is sent to people who do not need to be notified. Is there a way to designate who gets an email?”

So, there is some capability to tailor your notifications based on the notification type. But the recipient of those emails is typically determined by who has access to that particular project.

You can reach out to IRB Net Support. You have a local contact that’s out to support to get more information on what flexibility is available.

(Long pause)

“Would you please ask VAIRRS to add an RNDC annual review approval letter template to the RNDC available letters? Thanks.”

So, we will take note. We do ask that if you have suggestions for the VAIRRS library, if you would submit that suggestion via the Change Control Board and that is on their SharePoint site. But we will take note of this suggestion.

“When tracking, credentialling, and/or training, is it recommended to complete this activity in the Research Admin workspace or within the individual community workspaces?”

Because the required training may vary, it’s suggested that you do that in the committee workspaces where necessary.

(Long pause)

Porter: That is the last one.

Angela Foster: So, we do have more questions in the Q&A box.

Porter: Oh okay. Oh, I’m not seeing them. Oh, sorry. I was looking in the wrong section. Let me pull them in right now just to look at them.

Angela Foster: I’ll start reading them. The next one is from Susan. “We do the extensive IRB staff pre-reviews in the IRB states because the eventually assigned IRB reviewer can see the comments and the guides of the staff in IRB space. But the IRB members do not have access to the Research Admin space. The uploading would be a lot of extra work. We also find it much easier to track specific IRB actions pending in the IRB space versus the admin space. Creating agendas in the admin space seems kind of odd.”

Susan, I can appreciate your comment and your reasoning or your site’s reasoning for conducting your admin reviews in the IRB space. Creating dummy agendas does seem a little bit odd in the beginning. But once you get used to the practice of doing so, it is very handy to organize your workspace.

(Long pause)

Next question please. “We are still doing ISSO and PO reviews outside of the IRB Net platform and the approvals are uploaded to packages. Is this not recommended?”

No, it is not recommended that you do your institutional reviews outside of IRB Net. We do ask that you add your ISSO and PO to your workspace and allow them to conduct their reviews, and record those reviews in IRB Net.

The ERDSP and 10-250—which are the two forms that are used to do these reviews—are being converted into wizards which would require the reviewer to go into IRB Net to access the complete analysis (SP). So, you can expect that that change will be coming later this coming year.

“It would be really helpful if we could tag a protocol—i.e. as duplicate—where the primary investigator study teams could see it. It would act as a reminder to the study team to not accidentally use that duplicated affairs project.”

Yes, I understand the suggestion and there are other ways that you could alert the study team whether that be by changing the title to the new package and submit it. We do have the ability to update the title of that package and you could add a prefix, or duplicate, or asterisk, or something that identifies that particular project as a duplicate.

“We do our PO and ISSO reviews in the IRB space. The PO and ISSO are given global admin rights to IRB packages similar to the IRB staff. We notify them when packages are ready for review. Usually we have tons of revisions before a package is ready for them to review. They then enter the review and upload the checklist or assign IRBSP to the Comment section for the package like an IRB member or IRB staff.”

Thank you. So, there is no question there. But there is a point that was made regarding doing the institutional reviews in the IRB space.

But I do want to raise what if the package is not going to the IRB? Then what other workspace would be available other than the IRB workspace?

“Since administrative review is supposed to occur in the admin workspace, wouldn’t you need to tax studies with all of the information relevant to requirements labeled ICF, for example. So, all committee specific tags would need to be used in admin space as well.”

Yes, that is a great point. But with tags in general, because they do not go across workspaces, it’s often the case that that needs to be done anyway. But yes, to your point, if you wanted all of the committee specific tags to be compiled in one place, then they would. You would need to apply them both in the admin workspace as well as the community’s workspace.

“Is there a step-by-step guide or users guide in IRB Net?”

There is not one global user guide for IRB Net. There are many different resources, training energizers, notes, and the VAIRRS University included all of those resources and organized them to help you locate a particular step according to the role in IRB.

“Researchers sometimes create a new study rather than a new package in error. What is the best way to make that new erroneous study not physical?”

So, for the administrator, the best way is to, of course, recall that study or that package. It doesn’t go away, but it can be withdrawn, so that it’s not shown in your queue.

For a researcher, once that package has been withdrawn, they can archive it, so it does not appear on the date of submission. I’m sorry, in the projects.

“Is the plan to lead TMS training by city still in the works? If so, is there an update to when this might happen? Thank you.”

Yes, it is still in the works. TMS has proven to be much more difficult for the city administratively. But we are working with ORNT to establish a minimum review, so that we can get the TMS data downloaded in TMS and then uploaded into IRB Net the same way that city records are downloaded and uploaded into IRB Net.

“Will there be a mandate to use a standard naming convention when loading files?”

So, there is no mandate. There is no discussion of a mandate to use a standard naming convention. Consider that any standard naming convention would have to be applicable across all sites that are using IRB Net.

I’m sure you can agree that would be a major undertaking to do so. But yeah, to answer your question directly, no. That is not in the conversation at this time.

“We submitted the request for RNDC annual review letter last June 2022. We received an acknowledge, but it still has not been considered.”

Understood. I will definitely take this back to the CCB. We can go back to June ’22, and find that request, and figure out what happened. My apologies for the delay in response. But we’ll certainly get to the bottom and figure out what happened.

“Who will inform the ISSOs that they must use IRB Net? Ours have told us that they must use an outside ticket system for their requirements.”

So, we are working with the office that manages the ERDSP. When it is time for the ERDSP wizard to deploy, there will be communication along that chain of ONT to the ISSOs. I am aware of the separate service now system or ticket system that they’re required to do. We’re also working with the office that’s covering that process to come up with a more efficient way of getting that data to you.

“Will there be a time where there is a tag that can be applied across workspaces?” I can’t answer if there will be a time. We have sent to IRB Net our suggestion of making that capability available to us to require tags across workspaces.

The nature of our contract with IRB Net, it’s a SAS product which means it’s out of the box. So, we can’t dictate changes to them. But they certainly take our suggestions into consideration.

“Is there any plan to add more document types to the dropdown menus when study teams upload documents? Many packages have dozens of other documents and some standard items like the ERPSP when helping views in ISSO find an eScript without needing any convention for the product.”

So, with this current term of our IRB Contract, as I said, it’s a SAS product. You can’t dictate changes to the vendor.

But in the next version of the contractual relationship, we are looking into the capability to have customization such as the dropdown list, and the documents, the review types, and so forth. So, that is in discussion.

Porter: Now that actually was the last question.

Angela Foster: Okay. So, we’ll hold on here for another few minutes to see if any other questions come in.

Porter: Here comes one.

Angela Foster: (Long pause)

“When does ORD’s current contract with IRB Net end?”

We have another year and a half in the current contract.

(Long pause)

We’re only here eight more minutes. Let’s see if there are any other questions.

(Long pause)

Again, I’d like to thank everyone for your patience as we tried out this new platform and the pre-recorded webinar. I have to say, personally I think a live presentation is best going forward.

(Long pause)

“Is there a requirement for a veterinary (SP) consultation to be done in IRB Net?”

No, I am not aware of any requirement for that to be done in IRB Net.

(Long pause)

“Any requirement regarding \_\_\_\_\_ [00:51:20] will come from the \_\_\_\_\_ [00:51:20]’s office.”

(Long pause)

I think we still have five more minutes, Porter?

Porter: Yep. Yes, we do.

Angela Foster: Thank you.

(Long pause)

While we’re—oh okay. We have one more. “Is it possible to get the instructions on how to merge two different projects since we began?”

Yes. In fact, we can add something into our April publication about the duplicate projects. You can always reach out to VAIRRS@va.gov inbox and we will be happy to send you those instructions.

(Long pause)

“When learning a newer (SP) assignment for review, if there are an administrator and you cannot notify them via email, can this function be added?”

So, we cannot add a function. But if you could, I don’t quite understand what this is saying. If you could reach out to the VAIRRS@va.gov, so we could get just a little bit more information before we submit this suggestion to IRB Net, that would be helpful.

(Long pause)

Okay. We have a couple of minutes remaining. But the primary takeaway if there are no more questions, the ISSO and PO reviewer designations that are available in the admin workspace, we encourage you to use those when signing out your packages for institutional reviews.

The same designations are also available in the RNDCs workspace and it just helps us to capture information as we move forward in our discussions about the service now requirement. Having those designations captured in IRB Net would be very helpful to duplicate as needed when entering into both systems.

(Long pause)

So, I’m not seeing any other questions on my end. Porter?

Porter: No, so I think we can wrap it up if that’s all right with you, Angie.

Angela Foster: Yes, that works for me. Thank you, again, everyone for bearing with us today and I hope that we could all use these helpful tips to complete use of IRB Net.

Porter: Okay, thank you. Thank you for our analysts, and those who put the work into making that recording, and answering our questions.

Just a reminder, folks. Please do fill out that post-webinar survey. I know there was a ton of questions today and I’m sure you guys may think of some more after. There is a spot for that in our survey.

So, any feedback you all have would be great. Thanks and have a great afternoon.

(Long pause)