FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

eRA - SciENcv and Administrative Burden

Point of Contact	Lori Schultz (lschultz@email.arizona.edu)
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	After the SciENcv and AICA update, the audience broke up into small groups to discuss desired features/functionality of SciENcv and a central profile system. The information was collected and will be written into a shared document. Each of the groups had recommendations for making such a system attractive for faculty to use, including: current & pending support, joining with public access policies, Just-In-Time submission, federated login, linking with university systems that have much of this information, leverage work from CDER, help faculty find collaborators, etc. (This list is not the complete list).
Key Risks/Issues	There are unknowns about the future of the AICA, and what the coming presidential administration will do.
Meeting Summary	

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Expanded Clearinghouse

Point of Contact	Lynette Arias, Pamela Webb, Jennifer Barron
Activities/Progress to Date	Web development continues. Go-live pushed to March, at same time as Cohort 3 go-live. Future enhancements include: pull data from other systems, as feasible (SAM); automatic notifications to POC for expired information; API's (Application Program Interface); additional reports and data output. Developing detailed instructions/user guide for web system. Working group for financial questionnaire and integration with RAQ started work.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	Session was attended by approximately 100 individuals, most of whom are currently part of the Pilot and some others who are interested in joining the Pilot in the future.
Key Risks/Issues	Risks moving forward include entities not using the clearinghouse profiles as originally planned, not keeping their profiles current, entities still continuing to use their forms that they are comfortable with, and push of go-live date for the online system. Issues identified include the current highly manual process of maintaining the excel Profiles, the limited resources to increase the size of the pilot and any hurdles that might be encountered when moving toward an online system. Have been issues with consistent completion of tracking data, to be addressed with additional instructions.
Meeting Summary	A brief overview and purpose of the Pilot was discussed for anyone that had not yet heard about the Clearinghouse, including description of cohort 1 and 2, timelines for the Pilot and the Pilot websites, entities and current status of the Pilot. Tracking data to date was shared, as well as time saved metrics. We (sort of) saw a demonstration of what the web development team has done so far - projector issues limited the demonstration. Next steps in the Pilot were discussed along with how entities can get involved in the future.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Emerging Research Instutitons Committee

Point of Contact	Susan Anderson
Activities/Progress to Date	At the two previous meetings, the ERI sessions hosted representatives from NSF to talk about PUI/RUI opportunities, and from NIH to talk about the R15 AREA program.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	At future meetings, we would like to invite federal representatives from additional agencies to talk about programs or strategies relevant for ERI members. At the FDP Project Updates Plenary Session, Susan Anderson told the assembled membership that we welcome suggestions or volunteers from the federal partners. Also, the ERI group will work on gathering, reviewing, and providing information to help qualified ERI faculty participate in proposal reviews.
Participation	
Key Risks/Issues	We will seek to identify additional federal representatives whose agencies have programs relevant to ERI members and who could present agency information at future meetings. In addition, we will undertake collection of information from agencies about participation in the proposal review process to develop a resource for ERI faculty to facilitate appropriate participation by qualified faculty.
Meeting Summary	At the January meeting, ERI members attended the Faculty Lunch at which Dr. Michael Lauer, Deputy Director for Extramural Research at NIH, made a presentation of interest to the ERI membership, "How do we measure the value and output of research? Thoughts from NIH."

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Federal Agency Matrix

Point of Contact	Mark Sweet. masweet@rsp.wisc.edu Lynda Wolter; lyn
Activities/Progress to Date	Research institutions must interact with a wide variety of pre- and post-award Federal Agency systems. This session will be an open discussion on an updated version of the Federal Agency Matrix. The Matrix was originally created in 2003 and contains information on various Federal electronic systems. However, there have been many changes since the last revision. This updated Agency Matrix could have several uses: i) reference for institutions; ii) reference for the Federal Agencies to see other Federal systems; iii) documentation of administrative burden brought on by Federal systems. The eRA Steering Committee will also be looking for pre- and post-award volunteers for a small working group to complete the Matrix. 1. Collected ideas and data types to be collected for each agency system 2.Asked for volunteers for Working Group
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	•Working Group formed •Working group to meet over winter months to potentially have materials to present at the May 2017 FDP meeting
Participation	•New Working Group formed. •Working Group coordinators: oLynda Wolter, Northwestern University, lynda.wolter@northwestern.edu oCarolyn Pappas, University of Michigan, cpappas@umich.edu
Key Risks/Issues	Role/participation of federal agency partners Maintaining focus on the phase 1 of the Agency Matrix and not adding too many data elements to stymie completion
Meeting Summary	List of suggestions for new data elements collected Volunteers for Working Group obtained

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Subawards

Point of Contact	Amanda Humphrey, Stephanie Scott, Amanda Hamaker
Activities/Progress to Date	The Subawards group has a number of ongoing activities. Recent activity includes: -Significant Template Updates/Compliance Terms - Compliance terms have been finalized. Templates were updated. - Guidance Group - New Compliance Terms FAQs and Additions/Revisions to main set of FAQs. Launch of FFATA workgroup - new listserv. - Foreign Templates - Currently reviewing comments received. Working to refine to be consistent with other templates. - Fixed Price Clinical Trial Subaward Sample - Release September 15, 2016. - Risk Assessment Questionnaire (RAQ)/Continuing Assessment Tool (CAT)-Combined tool release with guidance.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Carryforward - Extensive discussion continued on the topic of carryforward. Information was presented based on discussions that occurred within the working group after the September meeting. Several options were presented regarding possible changes to the templates to help clarify who is requiring the carryforward restriction and additional languages revisions related to this topic. See slides for details. Membership voted and approved the language. Further discussion revolved around if FDP should vote on whether or not PTEs may restrict (codified approach). The committee will be sending a survey to capture data to futher aid in this decision: Can we get data as to the reasons/frequency at which entities restrict carryover? What % does this impact? Why? Survey forthcoming.
Participation	Template Updates/FAQs - Voted to immediately update the Use of name language in the current templates outside the regular update cycle. Carryforward - Extensive discussion among the membership attendees on this topic and the questions/topics posed in the slide. Summary – Further information is requested from membership before making a decision on an official FDP stance on this topic.
Key Risks/Issues	Upcoming survey on carryforward. Group starting up to work on the 2017 templates. Email Amanda Humphrey if you would like to help. Volunteers requested for the Subcontract template group. Group is in need of a leader.
Meeting Summary	The January 2017 meeting covered fewer topics than the last, but was still full of lively

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

discussion. Highlights included the updated FAQs for the revised templates and discussion over a change to use of name language in the current version. Carryforward was the primary discussion item resulting in lots of good debate. Volunteers were requested for workgroups. Reminder: Templates created to make things easier – don't change them! Let us know if you get one with changes, we'll contact the institution.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Uniform Guidance: Updates on Expected Changes

Point of Contact	Doug Bachman, University of Central Florida Edwin
Activities/Progress to Date	For the past three years, the Administrative Cost Working Group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss several important topics related to implementation of the Uniform Guidance and more recently the implementation of NIH's Single IRB (sIRB) requirements. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal and university representatives. The working group is focused on efficient and effective implementation of the Uniform Guidance (UG) and specific Federal agency requirements. The Procurement Working Group is committed to the pursuit of effective and efficient procurement systems that provide a balanced approach to stewardship of federal funds. The working group has shared best practices and brainstormed innovative concepts.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	•Decisions from OMB are pending on the Procurement micro-purchase threshold and the Utilities Cost Adjustment. -Implementation date of the MPT: Will there be another year for implementation? -Which federal entity will approve an Institution of Higher Education (IHE's) request for a MPT higher than $10,000? The IHE's cognizant agency, OMB or each Federal funding agency? •FAQs may be forthcoming on various Uniform Guidance topics. •The Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Board needs to update the CAS Disclosure Statement (DS-2).
Participation	Federal representatives, and University faculty and administrative representatives.
Key Risks/Issues	•Decisions from OMB are pending on the Procurement micro-purchase threshold and the Utilities Cost Adjustment. There is uncertainty of when OMB will issue FAQs that should clarify some elements of the Uniform Guidance, especially in light of the announcement that recently passed regulations will be delayed until they can be reviewed and approved by a President Trump appointee. •Implementation date of the MPT: Will there be another year for implementation? •Which federal entity will approve an Institution of Higher Education (IHE) request for a MPT higher than $10,000? The IHE's cognizant agency, OMB or each Federal funding agency?
Meeting Summary	The topics and key risks described above were discussed at this session.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Single IRB – Implementation & Costing Perspective

Point of Contact	Michelle Bulls, Jim Luther and Sara Bible
Activities/Progress to Date	For the past three years, the Administrative Cost Working Group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss several important topics related to implementation of the Uniform Guidance and more recently the implementation of NIH's Single IRB (sIRB) requirements. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal and university representatives. The working group is focused on efficient and effective implementation of the Uniform Guidance (UG) and specific Federal agency requirements.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	•Whether there will be additional direct cost funding for sIRB costs. •Whether infrastructure awards will be available to update/replace IRB systems to facilitate sIRB requirements and multiple entities entering data within a reviewing IRB's system. •Whether there will be an additional extension to the current September deadline. •When NIH will provide additional clarity in the implementation and costing guidance.
Participation	Federal representatives and University faculty and administrative representatives.
Key Risks/Issues	•Increased cost of the IRB process •Costs of commercial IRB is not known at this time •Increased workload for IRB staff and panels •Increased burden for faculty •Need for updated or new electronic IRB systems to accommodate use by multiple sites •Time to prepare for sIRB implementation was extended by four months to September 25, 2017 (NOT-OD-17-027). However, institutions of higher education (IHEs) are still concerned about the amount of work and systems updates that need to be made prior to the September deadline. Some institutions are seeking a further extension of the implementation date. •Direct charging sIRB costs will reduce other costs that can be direct charged to sponsored projects. •The administrative burden associated with applicability to Social and/or Behavioral research is significant without associated benefits. •Readiness of institutions to function as the sIRB. Implications include adequate personnel and technology resources. •Timing of clarifying implementation guidance from NIH.
Meeting Summary	The topics described above were discussed. Faculty and administrators were concerned about the key risks noted above. NIH assured the audience that they would continue to work with the community to provide for a smooth implementation.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

21st Century Cures Act

Point of Contact	Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technolo
Activities/Progress to Date	N/A
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	The most interesting and potentially impactful section of the 21st Century Cures Act calls for the creation of a Research Policy Board. The Board will consist of ten Federal members and nine-to-twelve non-Federal members. The Board will be responsible for making recommendations regarding the modification and harmonization of regulations and policies to minimize administrative burdens associated with the conduct of research projects. As the Board is established and begins its work, the role of the FDP with regard to the Board's responsibilities will become clearer.
Participation	The session was led by Richard Seligman, Caltech, and David Robinson, Oregon Health and Sciences University.
Key Risks/Issues	The FDP will continue to carefully monitor the 21st Century Cures Act, the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act and the National Defense Authorization Act to identify areas that impact the FDP and its activities.
Meeting Summary	The session involved a presentation of the main features of the three laws recently enacted by Congress and signed by President Obama in the final days of his administration. Selected provisions of the three laws were summarized and there was discussion about several of the provisions of the new laws. It will be some time before we learn of the full impact of the implementation of these laws.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

NSF"s Intergovernmental Personnel Act Program

Point of Contact	Joanne Tornow and Erwin Gianchandani, NSF
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	This session was attended by approximately 40 university faculty members and administrators, as well as about 7 representatives from NSF (three of whom formally sat on the panel).
Key Risks/Issues	
Meeting Summary	For many years, NSF has provided the opportunity for scientists, engineers, and educators to rotate into the Foundation on a temporary basis. Many of NSF's rotators, who are an integral and valued part of the NSF workforce, come to the agency through the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) program. In this session, NSF provided an overview of changes for all new IPA agreements that the agency announced on October 21, 2016, as part of its continuing effort to enhance the administration of temporary personnel at NSF under the IPA program. Specifically, NSF summarized three changes: (1) NSF is piloting a requirement that institutions continue to pay 10% of the IPA's academic-year salary and benefits; (2) lost consulting payments are no longer a reimbursable cost element; and (3) NSF-funded IPA travel to the home institution under the Independent Research/Development (IR/D) program is now limited to 12 trips per year. NSF representatives then answered questions about the new policies and solicited feedback on the extent to which they may impact universities' willingness to support staff in accepting IPA assignments at NSF going forward. For more information, please see the presentation materials.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Data Stewardship

Point of Contact	Melissa Korf, Harvard University; Rick Ikeda, NIH
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	The speakers were J.P. Kim and Dina Paltoo of NIH.
Key Risks/Issues	University representatives were encouraged to provide feedback prior to the deadline. Universities were encouraged to think how they can assist faculty in assuring compliance.
Meeting Summary	The speakers expressed commitment to engage the university community and to make efforts to minimize burden by working across agencies to standardize requirements as much as possible. It was pointed out that universities accept the awards, so they should recognize it's a university's obligation to ensure open access and therefore should take an active stance in assisting faculty in reaching compliance, including identifying opportunities to comply using "economies of scale." (i.e. perhaps a university should be thinking about creating its own repository if possible.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Animal Care & Use - CUSP Sharing Site

Point of Contact	Ara Tahmassian, Harvard U; Susan Silk, NIH
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	It was agreed that creating such a repository could be a worthwhile initiative. Such a resources has been developed at UW and has proven to streamline the process, particularly because it was a collaborative approach between the UW Office of Animal Welfare, the IACUC and vet staff.
Participation	The discussion was led by Sally Thompson-Iritani, Michelle Brot and Aubrey Schoenleben of University of Washington and moderated by Susan Silk.
Key Risks/Issues	A follow-up email will be sent out to gather a group of volunteers to begin designing the website. It is expected that it will include the standard procedures, which can be sorted, searched and filtered by various attributes. Record maintenance will be a challenge and the group will determine the best way to ensure that the information remains up-to-date.
Meeting Summary	There is support for this initiative. This database will function as an effective practice guide and will not considered to have been vetted or approved by OLAW. While the initial content can be UW's information, the group agreed that other institutions have valuable resources as well and will contribute.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Contracts/Data Stewardship

Point of Contact	David Mayo, Caltec; Alexandra Albinak, JHU
Activities/Progress to Date	
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	It is not clear how the National Defense Authorization Act or the American Innovation and Competitiveness Act will be incorporated into current regulatory requirements with respect to the micro-purchase threshold. David will monitor and inform the group as we hear more so that universities can make decisions regarding their procurement policies. We are also waiting to see how the changes to DFARS and the CUI requirements will affect our contracts. Regarding the data survey, 65 institutions responded and indicated an average burden rate of over 3. There are 6 items that were consistently designated as highly burdensome. The committee will work with this data to define next projects for reducing burden.
Participation	The contracts discussions were led by David Mayo and Alexandra Albinak. The Data Stewardship Survey results were covered by Melissa Korf and Rick Ikeda.
Key Risks/Issues	Contracts formed a small working group to write a "white paper" on issues to consider when drafting a FAR clause to address CUI. This is in response to our last meeting where Dr. Patrick Viscuso came to speak with us. We submitted our thoughts to Dr. Viscuso and will monitor any proposed rules for a new FAR clause. With respect to data stewardship, the subcommittee will be further analyzing the results and deciding which projects to take on.
Meeting Summary	Both Contracts and Data Stewardship submitted slides. See meeting page.

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

Open Government/eRA - DAP - Standard NoA

Point of Contact	Rick Fenger, rfenger@uw.edu
Activities/Progress to Date	There weren't any workgroup activities in the lead up to this session nor do we anticipate any for May'17
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	No decisions pending. Run up to the May meeting will include monitoring of DATA Act activities in the OMB, Treasury (USA Spending 2.0 and Data broker), DATA Act Section 5 PMO (DAP) (report to congress on pilot findings)
Participation	Open attendance, but assumed most applicable to administrators
Key Risks/Issues	From now through the May meeting new targets and objectives for this group will elicited and assessed
Meeting Summary	Overall turnout was great allowing for a lot of feedback. Observationally the group really appeared to spend ample time providing solid, well thought responses to the DAP

FDP Meeting Summary

1-8-2017 to 1-10-2017

OpenGov/eRA: DAP - CDER Library Test Model

Point of Contact	Rick Fenger, rfenger@uw.edu
Activities/Progress to Date	There weren't any workgroup activities in the lead up to this session nor do we anticipate any for May'17
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	No decisions pending. Run up to the May meeting will include monitoring of DATA Act activities in the OMB, Treasury (USA Spending 2.0 and Data broker), DATA Act Section 5 PMO (report to congress on pilot findings)
Participation	Open attendance, but assumed most applicable to administrators
Key Risks/Issues	From now through the May meeting new targets and objectives for this group will elicited and assessed
Meeting Summary	Overall turnout was great allowing for a lot of feedback. Observationally the group really appeared to spend ample time providing solid well thought responses to the DAP