Quick Meeting Summary

The FDP conducted its Spring 2021 meeting virtually from Monday, May 24, 2021, through Thursday, May 27, 2021. This document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and videos of the presentations.

Monday, May 24, 2021, 11:00am-12:30pm EDT	**Plenary - Addressing Structural and Systemic Racism through a Focus on the Funding Process** – This panel discussion included an introduction of the NIH UNITE Initiative, presented by Marie A. Bernard, MD, UNITE co-chair; NIH Chief Officer for Scientific Workforce Diversity; with commentary by panelists Byron Ford, Ph.D., Associate Dean, Pre-Clerkship Medical Education; Professor, Biomedical Sciences, University of California-Riverside School of Medicine; and Cheryl Townsel, President and CEO of Townsel Consulting, LLC. Events of the past year have demonstrated the clear reality of racial injustice in our country and the need for action. Within the NIH, there have been a series of intense conversations about structural racism. A multi-faceted effort called "UNITE"* has been formed with more than eighty stakeholders to assess and make recommendations in both the NIH extramural and intramural space. Foundational efforts have focused on NIH's culture and structure for equity, inclusion, and excellence including workforce based on position and supervisory status; recruitment; a broad systematic evaluation of extramural funding policies, and funding rate types for R01's based on race/ethnicity. Initial recommendations have been made to address health disparities and advance health equity, including issuance of requests for information and funding opportunity announcements.	Video Slides
Monday, May 24, 2021, 1:00pm-3:00pm EDT	**Plenary – Federal Agency Updates –** Agency representatives from the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Department of Homeland Security, Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable, Office of Naval Research, and Environmental Protection Agency, presented on news, updates, and changes within their respective agencies. A compilation of summaries of each agency update can be found **here**.	Video NSF Slides NIH Slides NASA Slides AFOSR Slides DHS Slides GUIRR Slides ONR Slides EPA Slides
Monday, May 24, 2021, 3:30pm-5:00pm EDT	**Operationalizing and Harmonizing Open Research Policies - Lessons from the NASEM Roundtable –** Greg Tananbaum, Director of the Open Research Funders Group, moderated a panel discussion that included Chris Bourg, Director of Libraries at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Geeta Swamy, AVP for Research at Duke University and Vice Dean for Research Integrity at the Duke University School of Medicine, and Maryrose Franko, Executive Director of the Health Research Alliance. The discussion started with an overview of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM) Roundtable on	Slides Video

Aligning incentives for Open Science, including the group's background and goals, work to date, lessons learned, and next steps. The Panelists then discussed the current state of open science within their organizations and where they aspire to be, hurdles to developing a more open ecosystem, how to overcome those hurdles, and engagement with agencies and universities who are interested in getting involved in open science. For more information, see the NASEM Roundtable's toolkit for fostering open science and Open Science Success Stories Database or contact the Roundtable secretariat.

Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 11:00am-12:30pm EDT	**Contracts Subcommittee – Other Transaction Authority –** The Contracts Subcommittee is led by Co-Chairs Melissa Korf and Elizabeth Peloso. The Other Transaction Authority (OTA) Working Group is led by Michael J. Kusiak, and Sarah J. White. This session included an overview and origin of OTAs that go back to 1958 used by the US Department of Defense (DOD), often as awards through a consortium. Also discussed was the transition of OTAs used by other federal agencies, such as NIH. OTA allows federal agencies flexibility in providing awards to institutions, and because of that there is no standard agreement, which creates additional negotiations with institutions. The working group discussed a survey done of 181 FDP member institutions related to OTAs. The survey results can be found in the presentation slides, which revealed the negotiation pain points. This session ended with a history of the FDP Troublesome Clauses Database 1.0 (TC 1.0), a resource for FDP members for improving grant and contract negotiations, and plans for TC 2.0. Survey data collection was completed to help identify and prioritize troublesome clauses and contracting concerns that will help frame system requirements for TC 2.0.	Slides Video
Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 1:00pm-2:30pm EDT	**Subawards Subcommittee –** The Subawards Subcommittee session opened by thanking Amanda Hamaker (Purdue University), who is rolling off as co-chair of the subcommittee after seven years, and welcoming Kari Tetrault (Institute for Systems Biology) as the new co-chair. The session continued with a review of the results of the Subaward Delays Workgroup survey and discussion of the final recommendations, organized into the following groups: recommendations to the FDP, FDP Subawards Subcommittee, FDP member institutions, and individuals. Details of the recommendations can be found in the posted slide deck, and participants are encouraged to share feedback/reaction of the results. This session also examined at cases in which state institutions are being compelled by state law to add additional terms to FDP template (for example, e-Verify), with discussion of challenges and recommendations; the co-chairs requested that participants let them know if they have feedback or cases to share. This was followed by a brief discussion on agreements to federal entities, with a review of the various arrangements (e.g. CRADA, Clinical Trial Agreements, and the few federal entities that are able to accept subawards), with a call for volunteers and suggestions for a federal partner to take part in a future working group to gather information and identify strategies to facilitate federal agency collaborative arrangements. Updates were then provided from the various Subaward Working Groups, including a reminder to respond to the draft IACUC MOU that is currently out for comment to membership, new guidance posted by the Subcontract Guidance working group, a reminder to complete the survey on the Human Subjects Data Attachment 7 before the September meeting, and calls for comments and feedback on the subaward templates and guidance documents, with updates planned for 2022. There were further updates on ongoing work with the Finance, Audit, and Costing Committee on next steps related to the invoicing discussion from the January 2021 meeting, as well as FFATA, which will be a future topic. The session concluded with reminders about not changing the templates, and the availability of force majeure language, and a call for suggestions for topics for next meeting. For questions, or	Slides Video

to provide feedback on any of these areas, members can email the co-chairs at subawards@thefdp.org.

Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 3:00pm-4:00pm EDT	**Compliance Unit Standard Procedure/Universal Protocol Template –** Bill Greer (University of Michigan) and Ron Banks (The University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center) opened the session with an overview of the UPT's (Universal Protocol Template) origin, and the partnership between FDP and the IACUC Administrators Associations (IAA),. The UPT aims to streamline the IACUC application to be more user friendly while satisfying regulatory requirements. While the UPT is geared toward rodent research, it is designed to accommodate all species. The draft UPT is currently being thoroughly analyzed and discussed. Next steps will be user testing with researchers, veterinarians, IACUC administration, and IACUC members (April -September 2021) with a planned finalization in October 2021 to be made available in December 2021. Anyone interested in participating in user testing should contact Bill or Ron. Elaine Kim (Colorado State University) introduced the CUSP (Compliance Unit Standard Procedure) project and played a pre-recorded demo of the CUSP Site. The demo gave an overview of the home screen, the different search functions, overall site functionality, and the procedure record details. The demo also included an overview of the different user roles. CUSP is currently in Alpha testing. Next steps are BETA testing during Q2 2021, Pilot in Q2/Q3 2021, with a planned go live in Q3 2021. Anyone interested in testing should email cusp@thefdp.org.	CUSP Slides UTP Slides Video
Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 4:30pm-6:00pm EDT	**Faculty Forum and Business Meeting –** FDP Faculty Committee Co-Chairs Michele Masucci (Temple University) and Robert Nobles (Emory University) led the session that focused on membership participation and FDP evaluation. After a brief introduction outlining the FDP Phase VII Goals and the role of faculty within the FDP, Jason Carter (Montana State University) and Michael Kusiak (University of California System) provided an overview of the FDP Volunteer Engagement and Nominating Working Group initiatives aimed at aligning volunteers and skillsets with organizational needs. The group completed a member survey with over 400 responses that collected information on member interest, experience and skills. Survey outcomes, input from committee co-chairs, and the Executive Committee will drive recommendations to better integrate faculty into organizational committees. Robert Nobles then gave a presentation focused on FDP Evaluation (FDP Phase VII Goal #2) and potential next steps. The organization has a strategic interest in evaluating performance (e.g. convince stakeholders, measure effectiveness), but a committee needs to be formed to discuss initial, global questions to give direction to the project. For example, what will be evaluated? What does success look like? What evidence will be used, and how will outcomes allow for improvement? And should the evaluation be internal or conducted by an outside evaluator? The group will work to generate an initial proposal/plan for September 2021. After formal remarks concluded, the floor was open for group discussion.	Slides Video
Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 11:00am-12:30pm EDT	**eRA – SciENcv –** The session opened with Michelle Bulls, Director of the NIH Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration (OPERA), with a review of recent changes to the Biosketch and Other Support format and instructions, and timeline for implementation, with a segue into the ORCID, NCBI, and SciENcv platforms as tools to leverage already available information and reduce administrative burden. Shawna Sadler, Engagement Manager for Outreach and Partnerships with ORCID, provided an overview of the ORCID Registry and its broad functionality, both for individuals as a repository for information associated to unique ORCID ID and record (including publications, affiliations/employment, awards/products), and for organizations as a tool to manage research productivity data through memberships. ORCID is presently integrated with 35 vendors and customized integrations are available. The ORCID presentation was followed by an overview of NCBI and SciENcv platforms by Bart Trawick, Director of the	Slides Video

Customer Services Division at NCBI, including current features and planned future functionality. Current SciENcv features include ability to create and save NSF and NIH Biosketches, NSF Current and Pending Support (NIH Other Support is forthcoming), Department of Education IES Biosketches, as well as integration with ORCID, My NCBI, and eRA Commons for auto-population of certain data. Bart provided a helpful analogy for understanding of how these platforms work together: where My NCBI represents the "house," with My Bibliography, SciENcv, and other repositories being "rooms" in the house; and agency platforms such as eRA Commons are doorways to access the information. It was also noted that SciENcv usage is growing rapidly as functionality across various agency forms increases; NIH Other Support will be completed in time for the January 2022 deadline, and Department of Energy forms are planned in the future. SciENcv coordinates and communicates closely with NSF and NIH in addressing issues and building functionality to meet agency requirements. Links to ORCID and SciENcv training videos, resources and contact information for questions were provided in the presentation, and are available in the posted slide deck.

Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 1:00pm-2:30pm EDT	**Finance, Audit, and Costing Policy Committee –** DLT Working Group: Partnership with NSF and Treasury: DLT – Distributed Ledger Technology (Blockchain). The focus of this working group is on improving the grants payment process. Currently the working group is in a pre-pilot phase for the modernization effort of the letter of credit (LoC) process. FDP members have been surveyed on their LoC workload and challenges. A proof-of-concept model demonstration was held on January 21, 2021, providing a broad view of how this DLT technology could be used. This working group may move forward with a pilot demonstration project. Treasury Offset Program (TOP): A federal law requires federal agencies to report debt to TOP when the invoice is 120 days overdue. The US Treasury will reduce the debt amount from a federal payment (offset) with the same TIN to collect the delinquent debt. A notification letter is sent by the Treasury after the offset has been made. Many issues exist for higher education with the current TOP program. The committee would like FDP members to identify federal agencies that have sent debt to TOP. The committee hopes to contact US Treasury to obtain a better understanding of the program, communicate our challenges, and suggest improvements. Public Data Access – Finance and Costing Discussion: Institutions are working toward implementing practices for public data access required by the NIH Policy on Data Management and Sharing (effective January 25, 2023), but the question remains of how to pay for the costs. The committee has had a preliminary conversation with Michelle Bulls, NIH. Funding options discussed were separate infrastructure awards, uncapped F&A pools, institutional service centers, or the federal government coming up with a third-party solution. Costs over the entire data life-cycle need to be discussed and considered.	Slides Video
Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 4:30pm-6:00pm EDT	**Foreign Influence - Management of Improper Influence - Enhancing the Security and Integrity of America's Research Enterprise Description –** FDP members are encouraged to watch the video and review the slides of this presentation for full details on all topics that were covered.	Slides Video
Thursday, May 27, 2021, 11:00am-12:30pm EDT	**Research Administration Committee –** This session, led by Co-Chair Lynette Arias from University of Washington (the Federal Co-chair position is currently vacant) consisted of an overview of the Research Administration Committee's scope and three key activities not discussed in previous sessions: 1) **Proposal Initiatives**, the goal of which is to explore opportunities for administrative burden	Slides Video

reduction on proposal submissions, focusing on business processes and requirements; 2) **Expanded Clearinghouse**, on which clarification was provided regarding the Expanded Clearinghouse subscription fee versus FDP membership fees, followed by discussion of potential future initiatives, including continued engagement with European colleagues, and collaboration with the Subawards Subcommittee on the financial risk assessment questionnaire as well as the internal Systems Working Group in the Infrastructure Committee; and 3) **Open Government: Research Administration Data**, which featured an overview of the purpose and structure of the group and updates on the Letter of Credit (LoC) Survey. Members are encouraged to view the posted slides for more details on the outcomes and findings of the survey. Upcoming plans for the committee will focus on identifying a federal co-chair, additional engagement with federal partners and with faculty, and filling out membership in the committee, subcommittee, and working groups.

Thursday, May 27, 2021, 1:00pm-2:30pm EDT	**eRA – SAM.gov and UEI Update –** SAM.gov was integrated with beta.SAM.gov on May 24, 2021. Six systems have now been integrated into SAM.gov and decommissioned as stand-alone systems. The next systems to be integrated in SAM.gov are FSRS and ESRS. SAM.gov registrations expiring between April 1, 2021 and September 30, 2021 have automatic 180-day extensions from the American Rescue Plan Act. You must be signed into SAM.gov to search entity registrations, and to the check the status of your entity registration. You do not need to be signed into SAM.gov to search exclusions. The standard for Universal Entity Identification (UEI) was published in the federal register on 7/10/19. The DUNS number will remain the official entity identifier until April 2022. UEI numbers are visible now in SAM.gov for registered entities. If you use APIs or data extracts to get data from SAM.gov, samples of the new API and extract versions that include the UEI are available at open.GSA.gov. SAM extracts and SOAP Services changed on May 24, 2021. SOAP Services were replaced by REST APIs. SAM extracts transitioned from SFTP to access through an API. Both are available for testing. To request a test system account at alpha.SAM.gov, email newSAMtesting@gsa.gov. The names of roles have changed within SAM.gov. The permissions associated with these roles, and how to assign roles are detailed in the slides. A new security feature in SAM.gov will be required for entity administrators in federal fiscal year 2022. This security feature is managed through login.gov, and entity administrators will need to upload a photograph of their state-issued photo identification, and provide their SSN and phone number.	Slides Video
Thursday, May 27, 2021, 3:00pm-4:00pm EDT	**Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT) –** This session, led by Steven Post and Suzanne Alstadt, both from University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, opened by reviewing the mission and participating faculty-administrator institutional pairs currently serving on the working group. An overview and discussion of the recent ThoughtExchange results on what actions individuals can take to enhance the interaction between research faculty and research administrators at their institutions was then presented. The ThoughtExchange identified three main themes: (1) increase interaction and "reaching out," (2) increase understanding and appreciation, and (3) improve processes and timeliness. The participants were then separated into six breakout groups, with two groups focusing on each of the three topics. The groups were charged with discussing their theme, identifying barriers, and rating action steps for each of the themes; the conversation was guided by individual scenarios presented for each theme. The randomly assigned breakout groups included both administrators and faculty, and participants were encouraged to think from the perspectives of both roles. The participants were then brought back together to present their top action steps, the action steps per theme were combined, and the participants voted in a live poll on action steps for each of the three themes. One notable theme that was	Slides Video

central to all three sets of action steps, and in every breakout group, was that administrators should try to attend departmental faculty meetings. The session concluded with a discussion on how to implement the action steps identified in the groups, and next steps to include the creation of a one-page guidance document with suggested action steps for institutions to share with their faculty and administrators. To stay involved with FACT, participants were encouraged to sign up for the FDP listserv and/or respond to the volunteer survey. If interested in joining FACT as an administrator-faculty team or for more information, participants can email the co-chairs at spost@uams.edu or sealstadt@uams.edu.

Thursday, May 27, 2021, 4:30pm-6:00pm EDT	**Plenary – Foreign Influence – University Panel** – As a follow-up to the panel discussion that took place the day prior, which looked at foreign influence from the federal agency perspective, this panel looked at foreign influence from the university perspective, which included both faculty and administrators. Faculty panelists included Dr. Michele Masucci from Temple University, Dr. Laura McCabe from Michigan State University, and Dr. Alice Young of Texas Tech University. To gain an understanding of the faculty perspective, discussion centered around confusion related to the disclosure of certain activities as other support. For example, how & when should applicants disclose foreign collaborations that may or may not result in published papers, foreign collaborations developed to author review articles, and ongoing collaborations with former students who obtain positions at new, foreign institutions (often this latter work is to write manuscripts based on data collected in the US, not to conduct new research). The panelists also noted that it would be very helpful if our federal partners provided more specific examples of consulting activities involving the conduct of research. Editorships with foreign journals is another example where it isn't immediately apparent where to disclose the activity (*i.e.*, in the other support pages or in the biosketch). Other points of discussion were outside activities that happen outside a 9-month appointment, and the perceived persecution of international colleagues. Doug Backman, Director, Office of Compliance, University of Central Florida, gave an administrative perspective on key issues. He described the additional conflict of interest disclosure requirements required by Florida law, which includes the reporting of financial interests of *anything* of value, and the broadening of activities to be disclosed taking place outside the institution. He also talked about investigations and interviews triggered by 'red flags' related to foreign influence that can be very labor-intensive, not yielding many results compared to the amount of effort put into these investigations. At the end of the day, he finds that faculty want to do the right thing, they just want to know what to do and how to do it. **Next steps**: The moderators will combine and consolidate all the questions they have received during the session, and share with our federal partners, along with this video. Another panel discussion should happen in the near future as the federal agencies release more guidance, and NSF releases the new PAPPG.	Slides Video
Thursday, May 27, 2021, 6:00pm EDT	**FDP Meeting Adjourned**	