



FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

The National Academies of
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

FDP Virtual Winter Meeting January 23-25, 2023

Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its Winter 2023 conference virtually from Monday, January 23, 2023, through Wednesday, January 25, 2023. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and video of the presentations.

**Monday,
January 23,
2023,
11:00am-
12:30pm EST**

Opening remarks and NIH Data Management Demonstration; Pilot Project –
This opening plenary session of the January 2023 meeting began with introductory remarks by FDP co-chairs Michele Masucci and Alex Albinak, including a reminder that the May 2023 meeting will be in person and a call for volunteers to participate in FDP committees. The session proper consisted of a panel discussion with Christi Keane (University of Chicago), Jim Luther (Yale University), Melissa Korf (Harvard Medical School), and Michelle Bulls (NIH OPERA) focused on the NIH Data Management and Sharing (DMS) Policy and the FDP’s DMS template pilot. The NIH DMS policy became effective for applications submitted for due dates on or after January 25, 2023, requiring the submission of a DMS plan at the application stage and demonstration of compliance with the approved plan throughout the life of the award. A goal of the FDP pilot is to test templates developed by IC’s for participating institutions and their faculty to create comprehensive DMS plans. Institutions participating in the pilot will provide demographic information and quarterly reports on institutional data, encourage their faculty to use the templates and provide feedback, and will be expected to participate for the full 12-month period of the pilot. Next steps for the project include creating a pilot website to house templates, data collection instruments, and other related materials, completion of participation agreements for institutions to sign on to the project, and continued discussions with [DMPTool](#) on a potential collaboration and the possibility of making the templates available via DMPTool. The session concluded with additional discussion and Q&A about the NIH DMS policy and the FDP pilot; members are encouraged to watch the video of the session for full details.

[Video](#)
[NIH Slides](#)
[FDP Slides](#)

**Monday,
January 23,
2023, 1:00pm-
3:30pm EST**

Federal Agency Updates – Agency representatives from the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and National Institute of Food and Agriculture presented on news, updates, and changes within their respective agencies. A compilation of summaries of each agency update can be found [here](#).

[Video](#)
[Slides](#)

**Monday,
January 23,
2023, 4:00pm-
5:00pm EST**

NASA UPDATE - Open Science & Data Policies and Practices –
Kevin Murphy and Steven Crawford presented on NASA’s Open-Source Science Initiative (OSSI). Kevin provided a background on open-source science, which is now a priority due to the availability of technology that was not present just a few years ago. Open-source science is a national and global movement that prioritizes equal and open access for the benefit of the public. OSSI implements the open science vision outlined in the NASA Science Mission Directorate’s “Strategy for Data Management and Computing for Groundbreaking Science 2019-2024.” Steven then described the SMD Strategy for Data and Computing. OSSI is a \$20 million per year initiative that aims to develop policy, infrastructure, funding, and training for the community in open science. It includes the recently updated

[Video](#)

	<p>Scientific Information Policy (SPD-41a), which is compliant with the recent OSTP memo on “Ensuring Free, Immediate, and Equitable Access to Federally Funded Research” and mandates sharing data, publications, and software produced from SMD’s research activities. The initiative further aims to increase accessibility, inclusion, and reproducibility in Earth and Space Sciences through a range of activities, including training in open science, development of Open Science technologies, and grants to support Open Science. NASA’s Transform to Open Science (TOPS) was also described, which is a \$40 million program to train 20,000 scientists over the next 5 years in Open Science and broaden participation from historically excluded groups. The presentation concluded with a Q&A session with the presenters.</p>	
<p>Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 11:00am-12:30pm EST</p>	<p>Safeguarding the U.S. Research Enterprise: Transparency, Integrity & Reciprocity – The first segment of the plenary session provided a brief background of and developments in NSPM-33 Implementation and CHIPS legislation, as presented by federal agency representatives Rebecca Keiser, (Chief of Research Security Strategy and Policy); Sarah Stalker-Lehoux (Deputy Chief of Research Security Strategy and Policy, NSF) and Jason Day (Research Policy Director, DoD). Selected sections of CHIPS legislation most relevant to research institutions were briefly highlighted. Standards for research security program requirements required by NSPM 33 are being developed and a request for public comment will be issued soon; work is simultaneously underway for developing the certification process for institutional compliance with established standards. The approach to investigator certifications related to non-participation in “malign talent programs” is also in development. A working group under the NSTC Research Subcommittee is creating guidelines for federal agencies to establish digital persistent identifier (DPI) policies as required by NSPM. Additionally, NSF has funded four cooperative agreements to develop model research security training as part of the CHIPS-required RECR training for all covered personnel, which is anticipated to be delivered to the community in a readily available format by the end of 2023. In coordination with the Department of Education, NSF is developing policies and a user-friendly reporting system for NSF-funded institutions to report transactions above \$50K with “countries of concern”, as required by CHIPS. White papers will soon be solicited to get the research community’s feedback on their needs and the desired functions of the Risk Assessment Center, a non-governmental agency to be established under CHIPS. NSF and DoD are coordinating on a harmonized waiver process for Confucius/Confucius-like Institutes. DoD components are engaging in pilot projects to help standardize disclosure requirements and risk reviews both within DoD components and across agencies. The segment concluded with a Q&A session.</p> <p>The second segment focused on updates from Michelle Bulls (NIH) and Jean Feldman (NSF) on the Common Disclosure Forms development for the biosketch and Current & Pending (Other) Support (CP(O)S). This has been a comprehensive effort of the NSTC Research Security Subcommittee for the past year toward maximizing harmonization across agencies regarding researcher disclosures. OSTP/NSF/NIH first worked through a clearance process for a “Common Format” approach to biosketches and CP(O)S. This “Common Format” would serve as the baseline, with any deviation requiring agencies to obtain additional OMB approval. The Federal Register Notice request for comment on the Comment Format for biosketches and CP(O)S closed on 10/31/2022. Several themes emerged from the 99 comments submitted by organizations, individuals and professional societies. Next steps involve continuing to work through and resolve comments working with the NSTC Research Subcommittee, who will guide the path forward to ultimate OMB approval and implementation of the Common Forms. The group is working as quickly as possible through a complicated interagency process to maximize harmonization to the extent possible. The segment closed with NIH and NSF updates on their agencies’ implementation of the NSPM-33 requirements; biosketch and C/P(O)S forms have been revised (and will be modified for consistency with Common Forms once</p>	<p>Video Slides</p>

	implemented). Full details are covered in the presentation slides and recording. The segment concluded with a brief Q&A session.	
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 1:00pm-2:15pm EST	<p>Faculty Listening Session on Diversity Equity and Inclusion – This “listening session” was convened by Michele Masucci and Alex Albinak in anticipation of possible future decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court that might impact Affirmative Action and other federal policies regarding support for under-represented groups. The Zoom session was attended by both Faculty and Administrative Representatives. The session was informal, and Q & A based and intended to collect feedback from representatives of different institutions. The main question(s) under discussion were how does grant management connect with DEI efforts at both the federal and institutional level?</p> <p>One question raised was how do current DEI efforts associated with grant submission and reporting procedures impact administrative burden? To what extent are institutions expected to provide information (and data) on participation by under-represented groups, and to report efforts to increase participation in STEM? Most universities have responded to societal needs with various internal programs and establishment of DEI offices, but few of these are involved in grant submission or reporting functions. Federal agencies have increased both opportunities and requirements, which has expanded the range of programs for increasing participation in STEM, but has also increased reporting burden. One example provided was that the space dedicated to “Broader Impacts” sections of NSF proposals has increased in response to the need to explain DEI efforts, but that cuts into the 15-page limit allowed for the research plan in the Project Description.</p> <p>Another concern raised was the disparity between institutions of varying size and research activity (e.g., R1 vs. ERIs, HBCUs) and the capacity to respond to increasing administrative requirements, e.g., scale issues with grant submission and award management. One line of discussion concerned the experience and interest of HBCUs, which have been increasingly sought-after for collaboration to satisfy DEI requirements, and do not want to be merely another “box” to check. To this point, someone mentioned the NSF GRANTED Program, which is a new initiative for R2 and R3 schools to build research administrative infrastructure.</p> <p>The session concluded with recognition of the need for experienced universities to share info with others (ERIs, HBCUs), and that FDP is playing a large role here already (ERI Programmatic Committee).</p>	No slides or video available
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 1:00pm-2:15pm EST	<p>Discussion on features and benefits available to researchers through the Science Experts Network Curriculum Vitae (SciENcv) – Bart Trawick (National Library of Medicine, NCBI) provided a status update regarding SciENcv’s current and planned features for creating agency compliant Biographical Sketch and Current and Pending Support/Other Support (CP(O)S) forms. The session opened with an overview on how SciENcv, part of MyNCBI, helps researchers and organizations leverage data across multiple systems—including ORCID, eRA Commons, and PubMed—to reduce administrative burden in creating/managing biosketches and CP(O)S forms. Current capabilities allow for creation of the NIH Biosketch, NSF Biosketch, NSF CP(O)S, and Department of Education IES biosketches. NIH CP(O)S capability is in development. General instructions and tips for navigating the SciENcv platform were reviewed. The new NSF PAPPG 23-1 compliant biosketch and CP(O)S forms are now available and allow for additional data capture (ORCID ID and other) and document certification. Further, known issues have been fixed (e.g., professional preparation sort order issue in the biosketch has been completed, migration of CP(O)S forms from PAPPG 22-1 to 23-1 to be fixed by 1/31/2023). A future workshop on creating an NIH/NSF biosketch is planned for February 2023 (visit https://ncbiinsights.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ncbi-outreach-events/ for info on workshops and testing opportunities). Continued work is in progress to engage other federal</p>	Slides

	agencies with SciENCv functionality as the harmonization of common forms evolves. For questions and feedback, contact info@ncbi.nlm.nih.gov	
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 1:00pm-2:15pm EST	<p>Conflict of Interest Subcommittee – This session was presented by Amanda Humphrey from Northeastern University, Lindsey Spangler from Duke University and April Pepperdine from University of Michigan. The Conflict of Interest (COI) Subcommittee discussed a proposed new demonstration related to COI practices and processes and how COI offices collect and manage COI data. The first step is creating a survey focusing on the annual submission of the COI disclosures. The presenters went through the draft survey questions in detail, soliciting feedback from the attendees that will be further reviewed and applied to the survey. There was a great deal of participation, recommendations, and suggestions, in particular on the topic of definitions to ensure that everyone participating in the survey interprets the questions the same. The subcommittee wants to ensure that the demonstration has value for all involved. The goal is to produce sample COI questionnaires and obtain information about the ways institutions connect COI information internally which may be gathered by different offices or systems.</p> <p>Additionally, the COI subcommittee shared that the FDP Expanded Clearinghouse updated the COI certification to remove reference to the Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) clearinghouse and modified the questions for further clarification. They are also working on a project to review the templates and create samples for management plans. They are still accepting management plans from institutions.</p> <p>Anyone interested in being part of the COI subcommittee or sharing their management plan should reach out to Amanda, Lindsey, or April at coi@thefdp.org.</p>	Slides
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 2:30pm-3:45pm EST	<p>Responsible Conduct of Research – Jamie Mohler (Research Integrity Officer, Purdue University) provided an overview of the changes to the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training requirements. For NIH, topics have been expanded from 9 to 11 and they reiterated that while video conferencing is permitted it cannot be the sole method by which the education is provided (NOT-OD-10-019, NOT-OD-22-055). NSF requirements, which are guided by the CHIPS Act and America COMPETES Act, mandated new topics and, for awards submitted after July 2023, faculty and other senior personnel must complete an institutional program of RCR education as well as undergraduate/graduate students and postdocs. But they do not require it be the same program of education. USDA requirements remain unchanged. An interactive discussion followed, exploring possible organizational structures to support RCR, such as using British infrastructure and definitions, the lack of cross-campus communication, and resources for climate testing to help develop training content. Potential training plans range from in-person to a combination of online and researcher self-directed, as well as asynchronous courses. The next steps include finalizing the matrix of requirements and soliciting feedback through Thought Exchange after the meeting. If interested in future efforts, please be sure to sign up for the Research Compliance listserv.</p>	No slides or video available
Tuesday, January 24, 2023, 2:30pm-3:45pm EST	<p>Subawards & Expanded Clearinghouse – The EC Subcommittee provided an overview of the EC. Currently 316 profiles are available. That number continues to grow each quarter as new invitations are extended. Nine new non-FDP institutions joined Q1 CY23, and profiles will be available soon. Next round of invitations will be sent 3/1/2023. Please encourage non-FDP single audit entities in the US or in Canada who may benefit from EC participation to join the waitlist. Help text has been added to clarify the distinction between FDP members and FDP EC participants as this is a frequent source of confusion. See <i>“Is entity a member of the FDP? [What does this mean?]”</i> in the General Information tab. With the last EC update, four fields have been removed: (1) primary auditee contact; (2) CPSR expiration date; (3) FWA expiration date; and (4) OLAW assurance expiration date. New COI certifications have been added: 1) expanded list of specified agencies; 2) conflict of commitment; and 3) organizational conflict of interest consistent with the provisions of FAR 9.5. New fields are currently unpopulated to</p>	Slides

	<p>allow time for participants to gather needed information. Validation will be turned on later this year. Analysis of FY22 FFATA data (NIH, NSF, and ONR) shows that subrecipients were EC participants 67% of the time. The most active non-EC subrecipients were independent medical research organizations, primarily undergraduate institutions, and research universities in Canada, Australia, South Africa, and the United Kingdom, suggesting untapped potential for EC growth. Operation of the Federal Audit Clearinghouse (FAC) will transition from the Department of Commerce to the General Services Administration in October. Notice of the upcoming change has been posted to the Federal Register (2022-27893), with a comment period closing 2/21/2023. Audit info in the EC is a useful resource for making determinations about audits and/or required management decisions; however, data should ideally reside in the primary repository itself. The EC Subcommittee is considering direct linkage to, and auto-update of, some of those primary data sources, likely starting with the SAM.gov expiration date. Leveraging primary data sources to improve data integrity and to automate reporting, with proper controls in place to prevent erroneous or stale information, is the goal and more discussion about this will occur in the coming year.</p> <p>The Subaward Templates and Guidance Working Group sent out a call for volunteers. Feedback on future template improvements will be gathered Jan-May, templates will be updated Jun-Aug, and final versions released in the fall. The Subrecipient Monitoring Tools Working Group survey launched on 08/17/2022 and closed 10/3/2022. 171 responses were received, roughly 20% from non-FDP member institutions. Results suggest that companion user guides will increase use of FDP tools, resources, and templates. The NSAP Pilot is pending Executive Committee approval for launch in Spring 2023. Financial Questionnaire to be launched in Spring 2023. Currently working on Risk Assessment Tool, evaluating the option to have one tool for annual risk assessment at the entity level and one tool for project risk assessment to be completed as needed. The Contracts Subcommittee OTA Working Group is seeking volunteers from Contracts and Subawards communities. The FFRDC Working Group will be working on refining description and goals, developing matrix, and mapping out how to work with FFRDCs. Will seek volunteers once further along. The State Law Working Group is up and running. Will soon be seeking specific topics and potential volunteers. Establishment of a Subawards Subcommittee is underway. Looking for 20 (ACTIVE) volunteers representing all types of institutions. Term of service will be two years staggered. Attendance at four quarterly meetings per year is required. Scope includes providing feedback to WGs, proposing new WGs, and guiding the Subawards agenda.</p> <p>New NIH Data Management and Sharing (DMS) policy went into effect 1/25/2023. DMS plans become part of prime awards and should not be hidden or withheld from subrecipients. Development of DMS plans for new funding applications should seek to avoid complications at the subaward stage. Impact to subaward templates will be assessed early this year. Will be soliciting feedback about subaward-related concerns and the new NIH DMS Policy, both as a PTE and as a subrecipient, and subaward template changes that could be beneficial. Reminders: to not require a multi-page subrecipient commitment form if a collaborator is participating in the EC; leverage a project-specific form to collect information not available through the EC. Utilizing the EC and FDP subaward templates as much as possible alleviates administrative burden for all. Keep your EC profile updated. Don't modify template terms and conditions when issuing subawards under funding from FDP federal agency partners. Contact the subcommittee to discuss challenges and/or onerous requests for subrecipient commitment forms. EC resources, including a sample letter of intent: https://fdpclearinghouse.org/resources. Subaward templates and other resources: https://thefdp.org/default/subaward-forms/. Log into the FDP website with your institutional email address to express interest in volunteering; questions should be directed to membership@thefdp.org.</p>	
<p>Tuesday, January 24,</p>	<p>Faculty Forum – Michele Masucci (University System of Maryland) and Robert Nobles (Emory University) convened the faculty forum and welcomed Dr. Michael Nestor as invited speaker. Dr. Nestor currently serves as Director of the GUIRR</p>	<p>No slides or video available</p>

<p>2023, 4:00pm-5:15pm EST</p>	<p>(Government University Industry Research Roundtable). Dr. Nestor opened with a brief presentation on Big Issues and how GUIRR and FDP can work together to advance the missions of both organizations. Dr. Nestor views FDP as an active body with opportunities to actually test new policies and procedures and get stuff done. He is looking to maximize opportunities for FDP and GUIRR to engage. He is also looking to expand GUIRR participation to include other key participants in the nation's research enterprise including national labs, industry leaders, and government officials charged with implementing research policy. Dr. Nestor then welcomed an open question and answer forum. Topics raised by the faculty included increasing participation of non-traditional groups in the research conversation; accessibility of research results and data; the social value proposition of research as a complement to the dollar-value proposition of research; and the impacts of shifting research funding from government sources to private sources on data sharing and openness. The conversation was lively and well received.</p>	
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 11:00am-12:15pm EST</p>	<p>Data Stewardship – The Data Stewardship Subcommittee led by Christopher Martin (Rutgers University) and Jennifer Welch (Brown University) hosted a brainstorming session to develop a few hypothetical case studies for future use. The hypothetical case studies related to the implementation of the new NIH Policy for Data Management and Sharing. An open dialogue occurred between registrants with the below topics designated as priorities to bring before the Federal partners at the May FDP meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are institutions ensuring their sub-awardees follow data management plans drafted by the prime recipient? Perhaps a guidance document to assist with a conversation between prime recipient and sub-awardees would be helpful in determining roles and responsibilities. 2. How are institutions planning for and responding to situations which result in abandoned data sets? 3. What should a PI do if their data set is too large for any repository to accept? 4. What if the PI of the NIH grant changes institutions mid-project? <p>Finally, registrants discussed the need for both sample Data Coordinating Center (DCC) and sample repository agreements; guidance from sponsors on how to approach sharing international data when there is a requirement to submit to a repository; and ownership and chain of custody of data once it is sent to a DCC or repository.</p>	<p>No slides or video available</p>
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 11:00am-12:15pm EST</p>	<p>Procurement Updates – This session was led by Cory Harms from Iowa State University and BJ Pivonka from University of Connecticut. This session provided the summary of changes from the Uniform Guidance related to Procurement. The biggest changes are related to; new language regarding affiliates/subsidiaries; new language referencing strategic sourcing and shared services for competition; changes to the Micro-Purchase Threshold and self-certification; simplified and defined types of procurement; and added information on domestic preference for procurements. Additionally, the brand-new sections added to the UG were discussed, such as adding language regarding parent, affiliate or subsidiary that is not a state or local government or Indian tribe; and the added language allowing the competition requirements to be met using strategic sourcing, shared services, or other procurement actions.</p> <p>The biggest change is the allowance of the non-federal entities to change their MPT up to \$50,000 without approval from the cognizant agency with the requirement of an annual self-certification. A copy of the certification letter from Iowa State was shared and can be found in the copy of the presentation.</p>	<p>No slides or video available</p>
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 11:00am-12:15pm EST</p>	<p>Listening Session Stephanie Yee of NSF around Research.Gov – Stephanie Yee, NSF IT Project Manager, presented an overview and demonstration of Research.Gov as well as to convey key dates relevant to the transition from FastLane. She began the update by highlighting several aspects of the proposal submission modernization that is underway and shared charts detailing notable</p>	<p>Slides</p>

	<p>2023 dates including: January 30th (FastLane decommissioning), January 27th (last day to submit in FastLane), September 29 (last day to submit revisions / view for proposals already submitted in FastLane). Since FastLane contains functionality outside of proposal submissions, a webpage with helpful linked references was provided.</p> <p>The demonstration of Research.Gov began with a new supplemental funding request and covered several required sections and navigational tips. Steps for sharing and allowing edit access for submissions were outlined. When submitting separately on a collaborative project, “collaborative research” will be added to the title. Co-PIs must have an NSF id and a time delay may occur when assigning new roles. Several key points related to the 23-1 version were shared including NSF approved formats, SciENCv and NSF fillable .pdf’s, as well as changes related to the Biographical sketch and Current and Pending Support sections. The new trimming service was demonstrated and it was noted that pages are not renumbered during this process. Emphasis was placed on the importance of paying close attention to the format version, noting that titles will have 23-1 indicators and that uploading previous versions will generate error messages. Checking the status of a proposal after submission was recommended and how to do so was demonstrated.</p> <p>The feature for sending feedback, which is welcome and can be sent anonymously, was pointed out as well as how to access inline help and various guides and resources. Bookmarking specific resources was highly recommended.</p>	
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 12:30pm-1:45pm EST</p>	<p>Research Security Subcommittee – Inaugural session of the rebranded Research Security Subcommittee led by co-Chairs Mark Sweet (Wisconsin-Madison), Lisa Nichols (Michigan), and Doug Backman (UCF). Currently recruiting active subcommittee participants, faculty, and federal representatives and listserv signups to respond to evolving research security-related requirements with resources to support compliance while minimizing administrative burden. Mark summarized NSPM-33 implementation, detailing the Research Security Program (RSP) requirements. Review guidance to ensure understanding of details around the four elements of an RSP (cybersecurity, foreign travel security , research security and export controls training, including threat awareness); listen to Dr. Keiser’s (NSF) focus on research security standards from the 1/23/23 FDP plenary. Per the NSPM-33 implementation guidance, the anticipated timeline is a future 90-day public review period for draft RSP standards, OSTP 120-day period to reconcile comments and finalize the standards, and agency publication, from which time recipients expected to have one year to implement the programs.</p> <p>Lisa discussed the Research Security training modules funded by NSF, which will have tracks for researchers and administrators (slides detail possible content). Intended to be open source and adaptable; SCORM will be a delivered format. Community feedback on researcher/student content included connecting security with data management; leveraging NIST 800-171 and CMMC framework; developing customizable tools, resources, and checklists; focusing on risks including not collaborating, citing accuracy, and data collection sources. Training for administrators will leverage best practices for strengthening the science enterprise. Community feedback included communicating with Senior Research Officers to emphasize additional resource needs; implementing in a way that does not limit creativity; emphasizing scale of risk in institutional risk content; developing a baseline for everyone and then adding audience specifics (broad usability). Participants invited for February focus groups (90 minutes) to understand researcher, student, and administrative perspectives.</p>	<p>Slides</p>
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 12:30pm-1:45pm EST</p>	<p>Finance/Audit/Costing Policy Committee – The FDP Finance/Audit/Costing Policy Costing Committee update was presented by co-chairs Christi Keene (U Chicago) and Michelle Bulls (NIH OPERA/OER). Michelle began with a report from NIH on an increase to late draws, a topic continued from the September 2022 meeting. An anonymous survey went out last week that will remain open through the end of February that aims to understand the root causes for late draw</p>	<p>No slides or video available</p>

	<p>requests. Nate Martinez-Wayman (Duke) and Alan Whatley (NIH) will co-lead a working group to measure and evaluate the late-draw request topic. Nate reported briefly on preliminary survey results. Michelle confirmed the intention that each IC should address late draws using the same criteria which has been developed by OPERA/OER. NIH is interested to understand the factors and problems leading to late draw because this process is significant for NIH given the volume of long-open grants pending closeout. After the survey results are in, they will be assessed and reported on likely at the May 2023 FDP meeting. Michelle and Alan will evaluate the survey data from a central IC and central financial report processing center standpoint. Christi, from the FDP perspective, spoke to how IHE's may ultimately be able to help mitigate frequency of late draws through developing SOPs at each institution to handle these issues. Survey available here: https://nas.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_3JJIiSmN2LqR5c</p> <p>Kevin Ritchie (subrecipient committee) confirmed that the FDP Subrecipient template front page includes the uneditable provision "A final statement of cumulative costs incurred, including cost sharing, marked "FINAL" must be submitted to PTE's Contact...not later than 60 days after final/each budget end date." The subawards committee will be reviewing the templates again this year and can revisit this term if needed. Michelle reminded that the subrecipient template was modified based on discussion after changes to closeout from 90 to 120 days; we need to find out the issues before further adjusting the terms and conditions.</p> <p>In response to the question of what to do in the absence of a response from the GMS, or diverse IC criteria, Michelle recommended contacting Alan Whatley - head of NIH FFR reconciliation center at OPERAFFRInquiries@od.nih.gov. The outcomes of the survey should help inform solutions between recipient, GMS, the IC, PMS and OPERA. Note there is a related policy notice, specific to revising FFRs after day 120 - NOT-OD-21-128 (https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-21-128.html) which is being updated.</p>	
<p>Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 2:00pm-3:15pm EST</p>	<p>Committee Updates – This session included updates from several committees and working groups across FDP. The Communications Committee has been working with Vanguard Communications, a PR firm, on the modernization of the FDP website, with the goal of launching the new site in May. The Research Compliance Committee provided a brief summary on outcomes from the committee's concurrent sessions on Conflict of Interest, Responsible Conduct of Research, Data Stewardship, and Research Security. See related session summaries for details. For questions about the NIH Data Management and Sharing Pilot, contact NIHDMSPilot@thefdp.org. The CUSP Project, which aims to create an online venue for institutions to share standard procedures used in animal protocols, continues to make good progress. Development and technical testing of the site is almost complete, and the group anticipates that the pilot phase will start in the spring. Institutions interested in participating in the pilot should reach out to cusp@thefdp.org. The Open Government Research Administration Data (OGRAD) subcommittee, which aims to conduct evidence based analyses of workload through data, shared two new efforts that are seeking volunteers: (1) HERD Survey Working Group: This working group seeks to quantify and understand the work involved in completing the NSF HERD survey annually. Interested individuals can contact Angie Rochat (angie.rochat@lmu.edu) and Jenn Garye (jgarye@fsu.edu); (2) NSPM-33-related Faculty Current & Pending (C&P) and Biosketch Workload Working Group: This working group is examining faculty workload related to use of SciENCv to complete the required biosketch and current and pending or other support forms required in federal applications. Interested individuals can contact David Driesbach (driesbac@fiu.edu) and John Leonard (jleonard@vcu.edu). The FDP Co-Chairs provided a brief update on the search for an Executive Director (the process is close to wrapping up!) and reminded attendees that the May meeting will be in person. FDP is looking into options, however, to support virtual participation in this meeting – stay tuned! The need for continued volunteer</p>	<p>Video</p>

	engagement was also highlighted, including a request for attendees to update their FDP member profile to list relevant skills and experience.	
Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 3:30pm-5:00pm EST	Discussion by Dr. Alicia Knoedler, Head of the Office of Integrative Activities (OIA) at the National Science Foundation (NSF) – Dr. Alicia Knoedler, Head of the Office of Integrative Activities (OIA) at the National Science Foundation, gave an overview of the Office, the breakdown of the directorates/divisions/programs, reviewed their org charge, and the OIA cross-cutting and operational work. She shared that the CHIPS & Science Act will increase NSF's EPSCoR funding to twenty percent of its total budget by 2029. NSF is focused on strengthening by inspiring the missing million and accelerating technology and innovation. Dr. Knoedler connected the NSB Vision 2030 with the NSF vision and the administrative pillars to these efforts. NSF has a new Chief of Diversity and Inclusion, Chuck Barber, who will focus on internal relations, funding portfolios, equity activities and White House executive orders. Dr. Knoedler reviewed the new funding mechanism, GRANTED, focused on improving the supports for research, e.g., research development and tech transfer, that are the backbone of the enterprise. Research enterprise staff were encouraged to lead proposals and therefore should work with their institutions to do so.	Video
Wednesday, January 25, 2023, 5:00pm EST	FDP Meeting Adjourned	