FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

Expanded Clearinghouse/Subawards Subcommittee

Point of Contact	Lynette Arias, Pamela Webb (Expanded Clearinghouse); Amanda Hamaker, Amanda Humph
Activities/Progress to Date	Expanded Clearinghouse: •Small pilot non-FDP member cohort (34 institutions) received invitations to participate in the Expanded Clearinghouse with a go-live anticipated for July •The Business Use Agreement has been updated and renamed to "Profile Participation Agreement" for all future participants. Other doc updates include the API Use Agreement, Instructions, and Data Dictionary. •Request API Token Form and Help Desk Online Form were created. •Non-frequently used fields were removed based on survey results from participants. •Reminder to keep profiles updated (many still need to update with their FY18 audit information) Template 2019: Almost done looking at the template update for the September 2019 release. Changes will be added to the documents in the coming months. Will include a major changes document for communication to institutions and developers. •One item left for discussion is the Certificates of Confidentiality (CoC) language. See Key Decisions Pending section. •Template Formatting - NIH has a specific subset of terms and conditions that are hidden for all other sponsors. Want to include a specific attachment 2A for NIH only to cover these. •Additional discussion regarding the effective date field for modifications. Question to audience – how do you use this field and is it necessary? Do we need it? Seems to be an added data point. It is being used in various ways by institutions. There is an FAQ with various scenarios/examples for reference. One institution uses it for USAID. One says it is useless. One uses as the date they send out the subaward and use it as a metric to track timeliness – but could deal with it if it went away. Overwhelming number would be happy to see it go. How do you look at the differences between the effective date and the execution date? Audience indicated this is a further cause of confusion. Discussion over what the FAQ says. Point made that the effective date should be in the body of what is being amended. Determination made that there is so much confusion over this field we will remove it and revise FAQs to address how to include effective dates when necessary. Late Subawards: Survey development is almost complete, we are working through the review and approval stage now. We will send to the FDP Admin Reps, as well as posting to the Subawards list serv. Institutions are encouraged to submit one response per submitting office, please try to coordinate. Financial Questionnaire Update: Draft Financial Questionnaire (FQ) was sent to the Expanded Clearinghouse and Subaward listservs for comment with brief survey on Feb 28,

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

	2019. Received 41 responses to survey and some additional feedback via email. 35 of the 41 respondents indicated they would be interested in testing the FQ at their institution. Responses were generally positive, but a small handful of expressed concerns about length. Already received request from an institution to use the draft FQ – we think this demonstrates the need and want for the FQ. DTUA Collaboration: Collaborating with the DTUA group to provide a resource. This will be an optional resource for institutions recognizing that every institution has unique policies. Goal is to formulate consistent, useful language – OPTIONAL for institutions to use. •Opportunity to reduce burden. •One document with all obligations. •Will come with guidance as to when it's best to incorporate the DTUA or issue a separate document. IACUC Collaboration - Institutions have asked about incorporating IACUC information to obviate the need for a separate MOU. Subawards and IACUC compliance subcommittee and co-hosted a second session at this meeting. They are exploring clarifications around MOUs, guidance and how/when subaward language could cover obligations of the Guide. Attendees are encouraged to connect with their IACUC and engage on this topic. See additional information under participation below.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Certificates of Confidentiality: Reminder that pilot language is on the website. Two choices available. Discussed recommendation as to which language to include in each of the templates/samples. Want to be as consistent as possible across the various documents. Long language is more comprehensive. Shorter language is better for foreign template since the subrecipients are less likely to be familiar with all of the details related to the CoC. Concern discussed over why these are proposed in this manner – seems counter-intuitive. Longer language drives home the point better for purposes of clinical trials and protecting human subjects data. Responsibility is to communicate the CoC policy. Shorter language is simpler and easier to understand which is why it is recommended for the foreign subs. Questions were asked of the audience and a follow-up survey was sent after the meeting: •Which does your organization use? •Does your organization have a strong preference? •Agree that one piece of language is the best choice? •Agree that the long language is the best choice? •Agree that short language will be best choice for foreign?
Participation	Approximately 100 people attended the session Cont'd: Fixed-Rate Clinical Trial Sample Update: •An interim sample with revisions was issued in November 2018. This is based on a per patient billing model. Meeting since the end of last year to revamp the sample.

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

	oName change from Clinical Trial to Clinical RESEARCH. Clinical research term covers broader use – people were hesitant to use it since it said 'clinical trial'. oPayment term schedule added to make more sense with how payments are issued under these awards. Amount Funded box changed to reference payment schedule. oAligning with other FDP templates for consistency. oUG required data elements will be clarified with NIH as they relate to fixed rate agreements – for example, §200.331(a)(1)(vi) Amount of Federal Funds Obligated by this action by the pass-through entity to the subrecipient, and UG 200.201(b)(3), a fixed amount award must certify in writing that the project was completed or the level of effort was expended. These UG requirements need clarification. oGeneral cleaning up and rearranging to put all clinical terms in Attachment 2B. •Created guidance document to use as reference guide for clinical research sample: oCovers when to use the clinical sample vs. generic template. oIn depth information regarding payment types and writing payment schedules for fixed rate agreements. oGuidance on issues specific to clinical trials. oExplanation of what can be changed in the sample. •Discussion over formatting options for the Clinical Research Sample (Word versus PDF). •Working group drafted a matrix to use when determining which template or sample to use for all FDP provided templates and samples. This will be further refined based on conversation at the meeting and provided to the community once completed.
Key Risks/Issues	Upcoming Activities: Expanded Clearinghouse: Non-FDP pilot cohort to go-live July 2019. Templates: 2019 version to be released in September. Financial Questionnaire: Assess a potential pilot. IACUC: Discussions are continuing. See the Session Summary from this session.
Meeting Summary	The session covered the following: •Updates from Expanded Clearinghouse subcommittee •Updates from working groups – Included updates for 2019 Templates, Clinical Trials, Late Subawards, DTUA Collaboration, and 2019 Templates. •Financial Questionnaire updates from survey and next steps. •IACUC Collaboration – Session held at January and May meetings to discuss incorporating IACUC information in the subaward templates to obviate the need for a separate MOU. •Certificates of Confidentiality (CoC) Follow up and discussed next steps.
Volunteer Opportunities	Email subawards@thefdp.org is you would like to join this group.

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

CUSP Sharing Site and Universal Protocol Form

Point of Contact	Aubrey Schoenleben and Sally Thompson-Iritani (CUSP), Bill Greer and Axel Wolff (Universal
Activities/Progress to Date	This session focused on two initiatives to reduce administrative burden. The first part of the session focused on the CUSP project. The goal of this project is to develop an online resource for sharing standard procedures used in animal protocols. The second part of the session explored the development of a universal protocol form. See below and session slides for progress to date.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	No key decisions pending.
Participation	This session was attended by approximately 45 individuals, either in person or via web conference.
Key Risks/Issues	No identified risks/issues at present.
Meeting Summary	The CUSP site is currently under development and the working group is preparing for the first phase of testing, which is set to start in early June. The group has also made good progress in building out the remaining procedure types. The universal protocol form is being proposed as a new initiative. The audience was supportive of pursuing this project. Discussion centered on topics such as: • How to gather information that isn't required for IACUC review vs. institutional liability that depends on IACUC gatekeeping (e.g., housing/procedure locations, personnel, biosafety review) • Need to be mindful re: how questions are worded – what kind of language is used from the PI perspective (e.g., disposition vs. study endpoint)? • Use of checkboxes and flexible language throughout the protocol form • How a universal form would look when presented on paper vs. electronically.
Volunteer Opportunities	Please contact Aubrey (aubreys@uw.edu) or Sally (sti2@uw.edu) if you are interested in contributing to the CUSP Sharing Site. The working group meets monthly. Please contact Bill Greer (wggreer@med.umich.edu) if you are interested in working on the Universal Protocol Form.

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

Emerging Research Institution (ERI) session

Point of Contact	Susan Anderson
Activities/Progress to Date	We continued to invite representatives from federal granting agencies to speak with our membership about issues of particular relevance to ERIs. We have previously had participation by two NSF components, two NIH components, and ONR.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	None
Participation	Faculty or Administrative representatives from 8 separate ERI member organizations participated. In addition, other agency/organization personnel attended.
Key Risks/Issues	Identification of future topics/speakers; continued full participation by ERI members in FDP activities and meetings.
Meeting Summary	Dr. Mirando is an experienced Program Officer/National Program Leader with both the science and administration of these research programs. He discussed the processes AFRI uses for determining funding priorities and developing RFAs, the types of awards they make, program eligibility, some newer programs, and how to participate in reviews. He also talked about success rates, lead times, and legislation. He presented information on grantsmanship for improving competitiveness and responded to questions. His presentation is available for reference.
Volunteer Opportunities	Suggestions for agencies from which ERI members would like to have presentations at future meetings would be welcome, as well as other topics/initiatives that we would like to pursue.

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

Membership Committee Meeting

Point of Contact	Jeanne Hermann-Petrin
Activities/Progress to Date	•Registration desk – provide assistance to FDP staff at each meeting •New Member Orientation – prepare and present orientation materials for new members •Member attendance/feedback – work with FDP staff to monitor attendance and provide feedback •Annual member survey - review, analyze and summarize for Executive Committee •ERI activities – work with ERI to facilitate their efforts •Election – Gather candidate statements and photos for website for voting •Institutional mentoring – match new attendee institutions with mentors, as requested
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	•Membership types – white paper recommendation for future phases •Membership participation – white paper recommendation – current phase •Development of next Membership Survey
Participation	Anderson, Susan; College of Charleston Arias, Lynette; University of Washington Brightwell, Webb; Harvard University Carney-Nunes, Charisse; National Science Foundation Hermann-Petrin, Jeanne; University of Tennessee Health Science Center Koszalka, Maria; National Science Foundation Kusiak, Michael; University of California Mercer, Jean; University of Tennessee, Knoxville Spragens, Melissa; University of Massachusetts, Medical School Sutter, Larry; Michigan Tech University Thatcher, Julie; Institute for Systems Biology
Key Risks/Issues	•Membership types – white paper recommendation for future phases •Membership participation – white paper recommendation – current phase •Development of next Membership Survey
Meeting Summary	•Minutes of the January meeting were approved •The committee approved a coordinator structure to support our various task areas. Volunteering and approved were: oRegistration Coordinator - Lisa Akin oNew Attendee Orientation – Larry Sutter oNew Member Engagement Coordinator – Michael Kusiak oGuidebook Coordinator – Webb Brightwell oWebsite Coordinator – Jean Mercer oInstitution Activity Coordinators – Melissa Spragens and Julie Thatcher •Larry Sutter updated the committee on the Strategic Planning progress

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

	•Lynette Arias updated the group on the Executive Committee Infrastructure Task Force including, project management tools, system development tools, policies and procedures, committee authority and scope, and how to intimate a demonstration/project •Maria provided a federal update – the strategic planning committee has four federal members participating from NIH, 2 from NSF, and ONR. Ten of the 26 Grant making agencies are part of FDP. We need to plan reaching out to the others. We will begin with former attendees, Education, Justice, Transportation and HHS. Others are reaching out to OMB to discuss the possibility of routinely attending meetings. •FDP Membership Participation Guide – Michael Kusiak will work with his marketing team on the document. We will post to the website, handout to new attendees, and have a copy at the registration desk during meetings. •FDP Membership Types white paper has been presented to the Executive Committee. It was discussed today and the discussion will continue to the next EC conference call. Lynette will be adding information to the listing of organizations to include the Carnegie Research Classification and the NSF HERD expenditure data. •The Membership Committee will continue to meet the afternoon prior to the FDP meeting. •Membership Committee calls will remain the 3rd Wednesday at 1 Eastern
Volunteer Opportunities	Registration desk - volunteers needed before the first evening reception and on the opening morning of each meeting Membership listing review – volunteers needed to review the existing lists and contact representatives to be sure the most current names are listed

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

FACT- Proposal Process Workshop

Point of Contact	Mark Haselkorn/Dave Reed
Activities/Progress to Date	*Developed a charter *Executive Committee endorsement *Initiated website *Expanded membership *Initiated two pilot projects to better understand the Faculty & Administrator collaboration *Quantitative assessment of research administration with the FACT partner institutions *Qualitative assessment of research administration with the FACT partner institutions *Five Member Institutions developed proposal submission workflow diagrams.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Develop a report for FACT activities.
Participation	Open to pairs of faculty/administrators. Contact Mark Haselkorn/Dave Reed.
Key Risks/Issues	No risks identified. Need to address a plan for FACT in the next phase of FDP. Also need to address how/if a "product" can be developed based on the committee's findings.
Meeting Summary	The Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT) of the FDP held a working session at the May 2019 meeting in Washington, DC. Thirty FDP representatives attended. After a brief introduction, the attendees were divided into 5 groups and tasked with the following: i) review proposal submission workflow diagrams from 5 institutions, ii) discuss similarities and differences between the models, iii) relate these models to experiences at their home institutions, iv) discuss the faculty/administrator collaboration that happens at each step, and v) note how these step might relate to the national research "agenda". A FACT member facilitated each group and each group reported back to the all attendees. For detailed meeting notes, please visit the FACT website.http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_184146
Volunteer Opportunities	Institutional faculty/administrator pairs are welcome to join FACT. Contact Mark Haselkorn/Dave Reed.

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

OG:RAD

Point of Contact	Stephanie Endy
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	
Key Risks/Issues	Launch survey
Meeting Summary	Speakers: Rick Fenger, Avi Tembulkar, Nate Martinez-Wyman and John Lynskey John Lynskey sub for Chris Berner Updates of OG work includes work on •Standardized NoA from last FDP session. No new updates from RBM; more news hopefully by September meeting. •FIBF data elements submitted comments before last meeting; no news from OMB yet. Recap: combination of PMA, legislation like the data act, open act, and great act are in line with OG:RAD PMA: performance.gov is best source of information and updates. OGRAD starting with goal 8 and expanding to goal 5 Four work lanes at higher level needed in order to move forward: •Process and Data Standards •Shared services and Infrastructure •Managing Risk •Performance based awards CAP Goal 8: NSF is one of the executive sponsors for this goal. Two outcomes so far: •Federal Audit Clearinghouse demonstration days •Publication of FIBF; comments being reviewed and analysis starting; Rhea to say more tomorrow OMB Memo M-18-24 from last September was both for cap goal 8 and for burden in general. Four major responses: •Centralized reps and certs; effective January 1, 2020 through SAM – one time entry for recipients and mandatory use by agencies

FDP Meeting Summary

5/19/2019 - 5/21/2019

	•Agency evaluation of recipient data to eliminate duplicative data collection. Internal to agencies. •Adoption of grants management data standards; agency strategy for integration by April. •Readiness assessment by agencies to adopt FIBF by May. OMB Memo M-19-16 in support of CAP goal 5 on sharing quality services Creation of quality service management offices for select mission-support functions – four of them: •Grants Management - GM •Core Financial Management - FM •Civilian Human Resources Transaction Services HR •Cybersecurity HHS is the designated QSMO for Grants Management, and it is in the early planning phase. Unique Entity Identifiers Moving to new government owned UEI (no longer DUNS, but doesn't replace DUNS) To be used in SAM and all agency systems DUNS will be phased out eventually in SAM.gov DUNS will be available for historical purposes GSA will share UEI standards and implementation details LOC Drawdown Survey Goal: what's happening in LoC system world for grantees right now. Looking at five of the primary LoC systems to get a sense of the administrative burden and cost in managing each of these systems. Looking at tech, people, and time. Easily connect to everything in the PMA. Beginning stages of survey project. Hope to finish with reporting out in January 2020 Call for award by award and also streamlining systems back before 2013 History of systems is that each agency learned from each other when developing their new system. They have done some baselining on the agency side, but the agency is very interested in our responses to the survey to streamline and improve, and possibly even move to a distributed ledger system.
Volunteer Opportunities	Happy for more volunteers and suggestions