



FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

May 24-26, 2023
Mayflower Hotel
Washington, DC

The National Academies of
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its Spring 2023 meeting from Wednesday, May 24, 2023, through Friday, May 26, 2023. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and video of select presentations.

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
8:00am-
10:00am EDT**

Opening Remarks & The Stresses on the Research Workforce: A Historical Perspective – Dr. Mike Lauer, Deputy Director Extramural Research, NIH, provided a historical perspective on the research workforce and what impacts researchers. This is not a “new” issue; Dr. Lauer provided information going back as far as the 1960’s through 2022. Issues cited ranged from unsustainable competition that ultimately discourages innovative work to too few faculty positions for qualified postdocs. Available faculty positions dropped about 8% across the board at all levels (Full, Associate and Assistant Professor.) The end result is too many scientists chasing after too few dollars and too many postdocs chasing after too few faculty positions. In the Postdoc arena we know that in 1985 most postdocs were US citizens; however, now more are foreign, certainly way above where we were some decades ago. Scientists have responded by leaving academia during the 1995 – 2020 timeframe; while there are fewer PhD scientists in Academia, Industry has benefitted from an almost 50% increase.

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

How did this come about? – NIH budget trajectory, changes in the NIH workforce and inequalities in support. Every sharp acceleration of spending ultimately ends and people and projects get caught in the pipeline. There are also career stage changes namely a huge decrease in funding for early-stage career investigators, often a plateau or reduction for mid-career investigators and the late career investigators continuing to do well and stay in their positions longer. The end of mandatory retirement for tenured faculty – amendment to the age discrimination and employment act from 1986 in academia-- led to a dramatic change in behavior by faculty and a crowding out of young scientists. This is predicted to continue in the coming years. Long term trends show an increase in the age of PIs supported for the first time on NIH R01 equivalent awards. NIH is actually funding more RPGs than they ever have and there are a lot more PIs being funded than ever before. The problem is there are more PIs than ever competing for the same dollars. And finally, average costs of a grant (w/inflation) have grown.

In summary, these stresses impact the research workforce and cause the development of a hypercompetitive environment including: (1) too many scientists and too many postdocs; (2) budget oscillations have lasting effects; (3) an aging workforce crowds out earlier career scientists; and (4) funding inequalities exacerbate the hyper competition. The following possible approaches may help to address these stressors: (1) fund more early career investigators; (2) fund more at-risk investigators; (3) cap funding available per investigator; (4) reduce numbers of trainees and post-docs; and (5) encourage alternate career pathways.

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
10:30am-
12:00pm EDT**

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

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

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
1:00pm-
2:30pm EDT**

NSPM-33, CHIPS, and Research Security – This session featured a Foreign Influence Working group (FIWG) update on NSPM-33, CHIPS and Research Security panel discussion moderated by Pamela Webb (University of Minnesota) and Jim Luther (Yale University/FDP). Pamela and Jim discussed the FDP's cross-cutting Foreign Influence Working Group's recent engagement in the listening sessions with the National Science and Technology Council's (NSTC) Research Security Subcommittee in connection with the draft Research Security Standards that had been put out for public comment (hereinafter "Standards"). FIWG, along with the FDP Research Security Subcommittee (RSS) had prepared a [series of 4 white papers](#) on topics in the draft standards, including foreign travel, training requirements, risk assessment, and the challenges associated with institutional implementation. Discussion points included: suggested clarifications and improvements for the Standards; a proposal for an FDP pilot around implementation; and the need for multi-directional feedback. There will be an additional listening session on June 13, 2023, focused on the Risk Assessment tool created by FIWG members called MART (Matrix for Assessment of Risk and Transparency) and on another potential pilot related to documentation of effective deployment and validation of faculty workload associated with the new common Bio sketch and Current and Pending/Other Support forms in SciENcv.

[Slides](#)

Mike Lauer and Michelle Bulls (NIH), Rebecca Keiser (NSF), Bindu Nair (DOD), and Harriet Jung (DOE) comprised the panel and provided updates on Standards implementation. Dr. Keiser's presentation, "Building the Research Security and Integrity Community", focused on the Standards as "guardrails" and actions to strengthen research, domestic, and international communities. Dr. Lauer emphasized integrity, using the example of a recent federal court case related to the 1000 Talents Program. Dr. Kung described that the DOE's broad mission requires equally broad policies to address the risks and equities. DOE has updated their Science and Technology Risk Matrix, now codified through the CHIPS in Science Act, and established an Office of Research, Technology and Economic Security (RTES). The DOE's Office of Science Financial Assistance Research Security policy implementation includes goals of COI policy finalization and disclosure harmonization. Dr. Nair discussed DOD's activities to address the gray area between collaboration and wrongdoing including clarifying processes and uses of disclosure data. Creation of DOD fundamental risk review guidance and a publicly available risk matrix will result. Michelle Bulls provided updates to harmonized disclosures. After OSTP approves the interagency forms, NIH will update Grants Policy Statement and impacted forms and instructions. The session concluded with FAQs.

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
1:00pm-
2:30pm EDT**

CUSP & Universal Protocol Template Update – This session provided updates on two burden-reducing initiatives of the 21st Century Cures Act – the Universal Protocol Template (UPT) project and the Compliance Unit Standard Procedure (CUSP) project. The UPT project is picking up steam again and has sent out surveys to participants to gather feedback on the form. Survey results will be collated and analyzed in the fall. The CUSP project is finalizing development and preparing to start the pilot over the next quarter. The session also included didactic examples of how institutions can utilize CUSP, a discussion on the role of the institutional representative (a key read/write user role with the system), and a live demonstration of the site.

No slides
or video available

Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
3:00pm-
4:00pm EDT

Association and Institutional Perspectives on the NSPM-33 Draft Research Security Program Standard Requirements – Research Security Working group, led by Mark Sweet (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Lisa Nichols (University of Michigan), Douglas Backman (University of Florida) and Sarah Stalker-Lehoux (NSF) coordinated a presentation on the University perspective entitled “Association and Institutional Perspectives on the NSPM-33 Draft Research Security Program Standard Requirements”. Panelists included: Kris West (Council on Government Relations (COGR)); Laura Raderman (Educause/Carnegie Mellon University); Amanda Humphrey (Northeastern University) and Lindsey Spangler (Duke University).

[Slides](#)

Kris West discussed the OSTP Proposed Research Security Program Standards and COGR’s approach to addressing the draft standards that were distributed on March 7, 2023. COGR has gathered input from members and held listening sessions with stakeholders. Topics including equity, clarity, feasibility, burden, and compliance will inform submitted comments that are subject to a 5 page limit due by June 2023. Additionally, to maximize and encourage response, COGR provided draft talking points that institutions could use in crafting their own response. Observations and/or questions include: (1) can these standards be equally implemented at larger vs. emerging institutions; (2) should standards be risk-based and also consistent across agencies; (3) definitions should be clear and identify a threshold for requirements; and (4) uniformly-applied standards are not the same as equitable standards (given the variety of types of institutions).

Laura Raderman provided comments on the NSPM-33’s cybersecurity protocols whose stated focus is on preventing ransomware and other data integrity attacks. These protocols present challenges, based on interpretation, including: (1) costs to implement unrelated regulations; (2) how to address personally owned devices (particularly common for student population); and (3) the scope of what is “publicly accessible.” NSPM-33 does not provide background information on how to assess whether an organization meets these requirements and risk-based approaches are not considered.

Amanda Humphrey provided an overview on the approach taken by Northeastern University namely that the university: (1) decided to pursue a single program across all of their campuses for consistency among those who travel to the global campuses; (2) is updating their export control training; and (3) are waiting for the research security training modules from NSF. Potential challenges include: balancing clarity vs. urgency; the need to engage the community when requirements are decided and durable; and enlisting staff when it’s clear what is really needed based on the risk.

Lindsey Spangler provided an overview of Duke’s approach. University has an established policy on foreign travel, is developing security briefings but does not yet have authorization for all travel. In terms of research security training, the basics are already part of required investigator training and are awaiting modules from NSF. The usual cybersecurity requirements are part of standard practice but duke does not have authorized devices which presents a risk with students. Existing online export control training exists and will be updated based on final requirements. Potential challenges include: (1) the lack of clarity and consistency; (2) keeping our stakeholders engaged while waiting; (3) trying to minimize burden given so many new requirements for both faculty and administrators; and (4) ultimately resourcing staff support to implement final requirements.

Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
3:00pm-
4:00pm EDT

Data Transfer and Use Agreement Update & Workshop on Data Sharing Issues – Diana Boeglin (University of Chicago) and Kris McNitt (Penn State) began the session with a brief update from the DTUA Working Group. They have been developing a back-office checklist that is available by emailing DTUA@theFDP.org; it will be added to the website with the next website update. The checklist is intended as guidance for institutions to adapt to suit their business processes and needs. They also presented information from the DTUA Feedback Survey. 97% of respondents accept the FDP DTUA from other entities

[Slides](#)
[Hypothetical Case](#)
[Studies](#)

without any changes. 86% use it for outgoing DTUAs. Some institutions only use it for de-identified data exchanges. The next steps for using the survey results include reviewing the free text responses, identifying take-action topics and choosing suggestions to act on. They are beginning to update the 1-way DTUA and will circulate for comments. Once the changes have been accepted, they will be applying programming to beta test. Please email DTUA@theFDP.org to volunteer to beta test. They acknowledged that the "Attachment 3: Identification of Permitted Collaborators" is confusing and will be significantly modified to clarify the purpose of that document. Moving forward, they intend to review the [Sample DTUA Intake Form](#) and explore ways to encourage institutions to adopt the form in coordination with the Data Stewardship Subcommittee. Finally, they noted that the biggest reason institutions have not adopted the FDP DTUA agreement templates is that institutional general counsels tend to want more terms included. The session ended with an interactive brainstorming session presented by Chris Martin (Rutgers). Various hypothetical case studies were presented followed by lively discussion from the attendees.

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
3:00pm-
4:00pm EDT**

Finance, Auditing, and Costing Committee – Michelle Bulls and Alan Whatley (National Institutes of Health, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration) provided updates on the centralization of NIH closeout activities and reducing the closeout backlog (reduced from 24,727 in January 2022 to just 36 as of May 2023) and an overview of the audit process managed by the NIH Office of Inspector General. OIG completes independent audits of HHS programs and/or recipients, including a Management Control Program to identify gaps prior to OIG audits. If there are audit findings, NIH will generally implement OIG recommendations; some recent examples were presented on topics including subaward monitoring, clinical trials, and post-award monitoring. There was a review of the results of the FAC committee's survey on late draw requests and discussion about next steps, including continuing the working group to further explore and discuss possible solutions and collaborating with NIH to publish additional guidance for grantees. A set of FAQs on late draws is planned for publication in June 2023, and NIH will work with recipient community to understand and proactively address the causes of late draws.

[Slides](#)

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
4:00pm-
5:00pm EDT**

Subrecipient Monitoring, Risk Assessment and Interactions with Internal and External Auditors – This session featured a panel discussion focusing on the Expanded Clearinghouse and subaward risk assessment tools. After providing a brief background of the Subawards and Expanded Clearinghouse Committees, the panel then discussed the results of a survey that was conducted in late 2022 about which tools FDP members are using for subrecipient monitoring and risk assessments. Questions included which available subrecipient monitoring tools are FDP members currently using, reasons why members may not be using these tools, and what new tools need to be developed. Members are encouraged to review the slides for full details on the survey results. The session concluded with additional discussion on ways to reduce administrative burden relating to subrecipient monitoring and risk assessment, which included encouraging members to first consult the Expanded Clearinghouse and discouraging members from using additional or redundant forms when working with other FDP members.

[Slides](#)

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
4:00pm-
5:00pm EDT**

NIH Data Management and Sharing Pilot Update – This session was led by Christi Keene (University of Chicago), Melissa Korf (Harvard Medical School), Jim Luther (Yale University/FDP), and Michelle Bulls (NIH OPERA). The session began with an update on NIH policy and implementation, presented by Michelle Bulls, and noting a potential update anticipated for October 1, 2023, that addresses the single budget line-item requirement. Christi Keene reminded the audience that the pilot, which is a collaboration between FDP and NIH, aims to engage NIH ICOs, Office of Extramural Research SMEs, the Office of Science Policy and OPERA/Compliance to generate consistency in DMS Plan requirements across NIH ICOs/programs and mitigate the administrative burden for researchers associated with DMS Plan development and implementation. Updates were provided on Phase 1 of the pilot, begun in March 1, 2023, which

[Slides](#)

has focused on testing the effectiveness and usability of two DMS Plan templates with approximately 20 pilot participants who are asked to provide feedback via surveys as well as participate in round table discussion. The general community is invited to participate in upcoming town halls planned for May 31st from 1:00-2:30pm and July 17th from 10:30am-noon. Recordings of the town halls and other resources will be posted to the pilot website when available. Phase 2 will focus on cost policies, in particular, to establish common cost principles, identify types of costs required, and determine how to identify additional/unforeseen costs that may be required to meet the spirit of the data sharing policy; this phase is planned to start in December 2023. Melissa Korf discussed the “DMP Tool” which is a free, open source, communication vehicle that is community supported, has been in use for over ten years, and that supports data stewardship between librarians and researchers at scale. The DMP Tool offers funder-specific templates that institutions can customize to ensure their requirements are considered; the two templates being tested in Phase 1 (“alpha” and “bravo”) will be available in DMP Tool on June 1st and users are encouraged to provide feedback on the templates. Jim Luther presented on the Phase 2 Planning ThoughtExchange on: *What challenges, related to budgeting and paying for costs associated with implementation of NIH Data Management and Sharing Plans, can FDP help with?* Common themes from the ThoughtExchange included (1) the cost of maintaining data after the end date; (2) separating DMS costs out from other costs with which they are intimately tied; and (3) line item budgeting of these costs. The session concluded with a discussion and questions from the audience. For more information, see [NOT-OD-21-013](#), the [NIH Scientific Data Sharing website](#), and the [FDP NIH DMS Pilot website](#). For questions, contact NIHDMSPilot@thefdp.org.

**Thursday,
May 25, 2023,
4:00pm-
5:00pm EDT**

Faculty Forum – Michele Masucci (University of Maryland) invited Michael Nestor (GUIRR) and Maria Koszalka (FDP) for a “fireside chat” style conversation, including a fireplace video burning on a laptop. Both are new to their positions and the forum provided them an opportunity meet the FDP faculty. Both provided brief remarks on their initial perceptions of their new jobs. A consistent theme was their mutual desire to promote good conversation and communication with the FDP faculty as a group. Michael would like to see much greater faculty participation in GUIRR activities and faculty input on policy issues. Maria Koszalka noted that over the new few months the FDP administrative team would be reviewing their current internal organization structure and looking for opportunities to better align their activities with the work of the FDP. Both Michele and Maria took questions from the audience. A general theme from the faculty questions focused on a strong desire to get more federal partners at FDP meetings.

No slides or video
available

**Friday, May
26, 2023,
8:00am-
9:00am EDT**

Contracts Subcommittee Updates – Janette Hannam-Hayes (Emory), Elizabeth Peloso (University of Pennsylvania), and Katie Cook (Michigan State) presented the Contracts Subcommittee Updates, beginning with an overview of the subcommittee membership and attendee interest in topics for the subcommittee to work on next. Current workgroups were discussed; notably, Troublesome Clauses 2.0 will be released soon, and they encouraged attendees to use the [FAR Guidance Resource Document](#) and other FAR guidance available on the website. The FFRDC review and negotiation techniques workgroup noted the characteristics of Federal Labs that can make entering into agreements with them challenging, including their governing regulations in the FAR (Part 35) which can flow down terms normally not applicable to research institutions. These can include unfamiliar Reqs and Certs in the proposal; it is important to review the statement of work with the PI to identify limited rights assertions and ensure any Reqs and Certs align with the type of research being conducted. Exceptions to their terms and conditions are frequently expected to be requested at the proposal stage. The group initially made an attempt to create a matrix of clauses from all FFRDCs, however they found this approach difficult to implement given the changing nature of these terms. The group now would like to shift its approach towards creating a commonly problematic FFRDC clauses document. For example, it is important to review the definitions of terms; “information” that requires protections could be very broadly defined, resulting in data security

[Slides](#)
[Video](#)
[Poll Results](#)

requirements for data that is not CUI (controlled unclassified information). There is a new working group, the IT Security Clause/CMMC Working Group; their initial topics are CUI and NSPM-33. They need volunteers for this working group, especially volunteers from smaller institutions to broaden the group's perspective. There is also a potential new OTA (Other Transaction Authority) Working Group, to create best practices for handling OTAs and to work with Federal partners to have agencies' approaches to OTAs align. Volunteers are needed for this working group.

The ThoughtExchange for State Law issues in subcontracts has been closed and the results have been published and shared with the Contracts Subcommittee: <https://tejoin.com/scroll/366979310>.

During Q&A, Mary Sladek with NASA pointed attendees to NASA's OTA webpage: [Space Act Agreements](#)

**Friday, May
26, 2023,
8:00am-
9:00am EDT**

SciENCv Common Issues – Sherri Bailey and Carol Radigan (National Institutes of Health, National Library of Medicine, National Center for Biotechnology Information) provided updates on SciENCv's current and planned features for creating agency-compliant Biographical Sketches and Current and Pending Support/Other Support (CP(O)S) forms. The session began with an overview of recent enhancements based on user feedback, including the ability to edit large author lists within citations, PDF preview functionality, character counters for large data fields, month/date picker, and more clearly marked error messages. This was followed by a Question-and-Answer style review of the most common inquiries received by SciENCv; topics included ways to enhance usability and reduce administrative burden, permissions for third-party login, clarification of the delegate role and functionality, importing citations without having to exit SciENCv, URLs in Biographical Sketches, drag-and-drop reordering of research products in Biographical Sketches, and document preview functionality. The presentation concluded with slides featuring helpful resources available for SciENCv users, with links to the SciENCv manual, online tutorials and videos, and where to go for help with questions on NIH and NSF documents and policies.

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

**Friday, May
26, 2023,
8:00am-
9:00am EDT**

Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT) – The session was led by FACT Team Co-Chair Steve Post from the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, and focused on themes related to enhancing collaborations between research faculty and research administrators at their institutions. The attendees were presented with a background overview of FACT activities past, present, and future, beginning with the new mission statement and the participating institutions from 2018-2023. The review touched on the following points: institutional contribution to the administrative burden associated with research; how institutional variables impact burden, such as mutual trust (lack of trust = increased overall burden); and identifying solutions to improve the faculty-research administrator interaction. Moving forward, the FACT team has applied to become a subcommittee of the FDP. They are also planning to develop a white paper based on lessons learned, namely that faculty and research administrators support similar actions, that together they can be a powerful force for institutional change, that process change is not limited to faculty and research administrators, and that involving institutional leadership in a triangulated relationship is necessary for creating policy change. They have put together a conference proposal to the NSF GRANTED program entitled, "Growing Research Access for Equity and Diversity Through Enhanced Faculty-Administrator Collaboration," led by the College of Charleston, an emerging research institution (ERI). This conference proposes building on FACT's experience in fostering the faculty-administrator connections, involving ERIs and minority serving institutions (MSIs) more thoroughly in the national research enterprise, learning from participants' infrastructure challenges, and developing all of this into an FDP demonstration. The session concluded with a substantial discussion on future goals and demonstration ideas focused on the question: *How do we continue to focus on reducing the administrative burden in research by improving faculty-research administrator interactions?* Many of the suggestions centered around trust and

[Slides](#)

creating strong relationships between faculty and administrators. Institutions interested in participating in FACT can reference the presentation slides for the requirements associated with joining; additionally, they may contact the FACT Co-Chairs Steve Post (spost@uams.edu) and Suzanne Alstadt (sealstadt@uams.edu) or visit the [FACT website](#).

Friday, May
26, 2023,
9:15am-
10:30am EDT

Subawards and Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittees –

[Slides](#)

Subawards Subcommittee: The session opened with an overview of active working groups (Templates, Subrecipient Monitoring Tools, FAQ/Guidance). Volunteer participation on the proposed standing Subawards Subcommittee, entailing four quarterly meetings (first one in June) was encouraged, and targeted outreach is planned to broaden institutional and demographic representation of the subcommittee members. Alice Reuther has stepped down as subcommittee co-chair; the other co-chairs thanked her for her service and dedication, and a call for a new co-chair will be announced soon. Other Transaction Agreement (OTA)-sourced subawards remain on the radar, and co-chairs will seek volunteers to work with the Contracts Subcommittee OTA Working Group, which focuses on OTAs as prime awards. In the interim, members can adapt the FDP Subcontract Sample for OTAs and should send OTA-related questions to subawards@thefdp.org. NIH's recent guide notice on subaward/consortium written agreements (NOT-OD-23-133, issued May 19, 2023, with effective date of October 1, 2023), was briefly discussed. It was noted that further guidance pertaining to its impact on FDP Subawards will be forthcoming as more information is released by NIH. The co-chairs discussed their role in clarifying expectations and identifying/mediating issues related to subawards between FDP members, versus being an enforcement body. Participants commented that FDP administrative contacts, who have knowledge about the purpose of the templates, are a valuable resource within FDP institutions to help navigate issues and streamline negotiation. The presenters reminded membership that using FDP subaward template fields as designed (i.e., drop downs, additional terms section) is not editing the template; however, edits to the text within terms requires removal of the FDP moniker and should be avoided between FDP members. A template revision is planned for Fall 2023 and participants were asked to submit requests for substantive changes by June 30th using the Change Request Form/Guidance for Change Requests on the FDP website. Other general reminders included using current version of template/attachments and taking advantage of unilateral amendments where appropriate and mutually agreed upon. Any questions/issues, including template typos or formatting corrections, should be directed to subawards@thefdp.org. The topic of State Law and subawards was tabled, the co-chairs noted that conversation will ultimately move to the State Law Working Group under the Contracts Subcommittee.

Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittee: An overview of the Expanded Clearinghouse and its benefits to reducing administrative burden was provided. Currently there are 323 profiles, of which 216 are FDP members and 107 are non-FDP members. The next round of quarterly invitations will go out June 5. Jennifer Rodis was welcomed as new Expanded Clearinghouse co-chair, replacing Denise Moody who has taken a new position but will remain a valued friend of the FDP. A review of changes to the COI section, which were added in January 2023, covered additional agency-specific certifications (NASA, DoE) and new certifications related to organizational COI and conflicts of commitment. Clearinghouse members were advised to review the new fields in preparation for required completion of these sections early next year. The single audit section was also reviewed; at this time, members should answer questions as they relate to their specific institution and provide a "yes" response for *any* findings related directly to the institution (including financial aid), with explanatory comments in the comments section. The first non-US single audit institution was welcomed to the clearinghouse. Future activities include exploration of API integrations with SAM.gov/Federal Audit Clearinghouse and research security certifications. Members were reminded to keep their Clearinghouse profiles and audit information up-to-date, and to email echelp@thefdp.org for assistance with the portal, or ExpClearinghouse@thefdp.org for general questions.

**Friday, May
26, 2023,
9:15am-
10:30am EDT**

Faculty Business Meeting – Michele Masucci (University of Maryland) led the Faculty Business meeting. Conversation centered around the purpose and goals for the internal FDP administrative reorganization concurrent with the onboarding of the new Executive Director, Maria Koszalka. The assessment uncovered how many different jobs former Executive Director, David Wright, was actually doing - many more than one person could realistically do well. This realization is prompting Maria and her team (of one other person!) to become a more professional organization, including utilizing consultants to fulfill some tasks. The group continued its conversation around how to get more federal partners to participate at FDP meetings, and what role the faculty might play in the broader policy conversations.

No slides or video
available

**Friday, May
26, 2023,
10:45am-
12:00pm EDT**

Closing Remarks & Committee Report Outs – Communications Committee
With the assistance of Vanguard Communications, a PR/marketing firm, the FDP Strategic Communications Plan was finalized as of July 2022. The plan promotes consistent messaging for all communications and materials issued by the FDP for all four of FDP's target audiences: Federal partners, member institutions, member participants (volunteers), and non-members. One of the goals of the plan is a newly revamped website, which was previewed with a brief walk-through during the meeting. Any requests for updates to the current FDP website may be limited while the Communications Committee transitions the content over the new website. Questions can be directed to communications@thefdp.org.

No slides or video
available

Foreign Influence Working Group

This unique working group includes representatives from several Federal partners: NSF, OSTP, DOE, and NIH. Since January they have been seeking input regarding the various definitions of appointments, to help with the development of new COI (Conflict of Interest) forms. They set up listening sessions and published a White Paper on four topics related to research security: Foreign Travel Security, Training, Risk-Based Approaches to Implementation and Research Security Program Self-Assessment, and Implementation Considerations at Institutions. That [document](#) can be found on the FDP website in the "Announcements" column on the landing page, along with the [Power Point slides](#) from the listening session on May 18, 2023. The group is also contemplating a possible pilot when the standards are published to establish best practices and processes related to research security. There will be a June 13 listening session, during which a tool will be demonstrated. There is another possible pilot of SciENCv and the harmonized forms to interrogate how SciENCv integrates the harmonized forms and what are the pain points of the process. They are starting to discuss ways to improve the Collaborators and Other Affiliations form to more easily collect names and remove names beyond the 48-month period. The next two topics will be Cybersecurity and Export Controls; more to be reported at the September 2023 meeting.

Research Security Subcommittee

This subcommittee presents the institution's perspective of NSPM-33. [COGR](#) has published a response to the memo. The draft standards are not risk-based and so pose additional administrative burden if implemented as currently written. The standards for foreign travel and cybersecurity are of particular concern. The subcommittee sent out a survey of institutions to gauge readiness to comply with the standards. Most institutions are not ready; NSF is developing training modules on the standards, for which many institutions are waiting before developing their own.

Finance, Audit, and Costing

The NIH closeout backlog has been significantly reduced, from over 24,000 awards needing to be closed out in January 2022, to just 36 in May 2023. Recent NIH audit findings include foreign subrecipient monitoring issues, ClinicalTrials.gov compliance, timely close out, and late draw requests. Regarding this final issue, it was noted that in certain circumstances, late draws are acceptable; you are encouraged to reach out to your Grant Management

Specialist (GMS) to discuss the situation. Finally, FAQs on liquidation will be coming soon.

Expanded Clearinghouse and Subawards Subcommittees

The [Expanded Clearinghouse](#) (EC) is an excellent resource for subrecipient risk assessments and monitoring. FDP members are highly encouraged to use it. It contains 323 organizational profiles, including all FDP members, other non-FDP members, and our first non-US organization subject to the Single Audit. There is a survey available for institutions currently not in the EC to see if it would be a good fit to join. The EC is a tool for reducing the administrative burden and should be communicated to any staff involved in the subrecipient risk assessment/monitoring tasks. If an FDP member institution sends another FDP member institution a subrecipient profile questionnaire, you should reach out to the sending FDP institution's contact person so that they can train the person sending the questionnaire on the EC. Future upgrades may include using information in SAM.gov and the Federal Audit Clearinghouse to directly and automatically populate EC data elements. The new set of COI (Conflict of Interest) questions on the Certifications tab specifically call out the individual requirements of PHS, NSF, DOE, and NASA; responses to these questions will not be made mandatory yet, with validation to be turned on around early 2024. The EC is seeking volunteers; please email ExpClearinghouse@thefdp.org or use the member website to sign up.

The Subawards Subcommittee is asking for more diverse perspectives to be included; volunteers from ERIs (Emerging Research Institutions), HBCUs, and other institutions are being recruited now. The Subaward Subcommittee will be updating the Subaward Templates and FAQs/Guidance Document in the next few months. Emerging topics for the Templates and Guidance Working Groups to consider include the [NIH Data Management and Sharing Plan policy](#), [NSF's Safe and Inclusive Working Environments for Off-Campus or Off-Site Research](#), and the very recent [NIH updates to foreign subawards policy](#). On a related note, the drop-down option in the templates in Attachment 2 for attaching the Data Management Plan to the subaward agreement that says "Available upon request" may be removed due to changing requirements.

NIH Data Management and Sharing Plan (DMSP) Pilot

The first version of the DMSP template (Alpha) and the second version (Bravo) are available on the [website](#). Additional materials and guidance will be added and announced. 20 organizations signed up for Pilot Phase 1. Two Town Halls, one on May 31 and the next on June 17, 10:30am EDT to noon EDT, are planned. The Pilot DMSP templates are available in dmptool.org effective June 1, 2023; if the lack of the forms in dmptool.org was a hurdle for your institution to sign up for the Pilot, please consider joining now. Phase 2 will consider the cost policies vis a vis the DMSP; the group is targeting December 2023 for Phase 2 to begin.

Faculty Committee

This committee includes all types of FDP members, not just faculty; its unique membership helps to translate issues faculty face and communicate them effectively to administrative representatives. At the Faculty Forum, representatives for GUIRR (Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable, the convening entity for FDP) and the new FDP Executive Director, Maria Koszalka, discussed shared synergies and potential partnerships. During the Business Meeting, faculty were more engaged than ever in issues they face. Upcoming action items include evaluating the FDP, creating and sending out the next workload survey, starting to plan Phase VIII, reviewing FDP's relationship with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS), the administrative burden on HBCUs, ERIs, and other types of institutions conducting research, the research integrity environment, what faculty can do to build trust in science and academia, and more effectively communicating efforts and results of grant-funded research.

Compliance Unit Standard Procedures (CUSP) Committee

The committee is getting ready to launch a pilot for their online repository for common IACUC protocols. They urged institutions to begin having internal discussions to see if there is interest in participating. A 1-page informational document is available; email CUSP@thefdp.org for a copy.

Contracts Subcommittee

The committee is working to identify common contract process that can be expedited. They are also staying on top of and responding to new legal requirements. They provide a forum to discuss contracting issues and invite Federal partners to join the discussion. There are about 7 working groups. The FFRDC working group is dealing with the challenges contracting with/to Federal laboratories. They have published the [Fundamental Research Determination Request Templates](#), which provides three templates for three different scenarios. They have also published [a matrix to decipher the FAR](#). Keep checking their [website](#) for additional resources to be announced. A potential Other Transaction Authority (OTA) working group is being discussed; initial tasks would include creating guidance on working with Federal agencies on OTAs and identifying the top 10 OTA problematic clauses and phrases. The State Laws working group has a [ThoughtExchange](#) that is still open for commenting, voting on comments, and providing feedback. Please continue contributing.

SciENCv/Research Systems Technology Committee (RSTC)

First, they offered their heartfelt gratitude to Ron Splittgerber, who is retiring; without Ron's efforts, SciENCv would not exist. Thank you, Ron! The Committee noted that their session earlier on Friday was recorded and would be posted online. The NCBI (National Center for Biotechnology Information) team has made improvements to the SciENCv system based on feedback from FDP members. You are now able to share a Biosketch with the PI before certifying, enabling administrative users to confirm the accuracy of the Biosketch before generating a signed version. Opportunities to test SciENCv will be posted to the website. The RSTC will open for new members; watch for an announcement. They also discussed the harmonized forms and PIDs (Persistent Identifiers), which help with auto-populating forms.

FACT (Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team)

FACT has refined their mission statement. They noted that administrative burden comes from Federal agency requirements as well as internally within institutions. They discussed lessons learned during COVID and are actively reaching out to other populations on this topic. They have applied to become an official subcommittee of the FDP. They discussed the need to build a culture of trust among faculty, administrators, and leadership; turnover, poor training, and poor communication erode that trust. These must improve. They discussed a possible pilot to consider in the future. A group of FACT members have applied for NSF's GRANTED program, with the College of Charleston as the lead organization. Finally, the topic of research security came up; they reiterated that it needs to be part of the culture of academic research.

Friday, May
26, 2023,
12:00pm EDT

FDP Meeting Adjourned