



FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

Redefining the Government & University Research Partnership

FDP Expanded Clearinghouse

Lynette Arias, University of Washington

Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota

Jennifer Barron, Johns Hopkins University

FDP Meeting – Sept 2017



Agenda

- Final Pilot Report to Executive Committee
 - Background and Purpose
 - Phase II – Web based System
 - Evaluation Data and Outcomes
 - Pilot Resources (Phase I and II)
 - Phase III – Post Pilot
 - Recommendations



Remember where it all began?





Problem Requiring a Solution

- Subrecipient Monitoring Programs include forms, forms and more forms:
 - **Entity based** info to perform risk assessment
 - **Project based** information to perform non fiscal/audit compliance and risk assessment reviews per project
 - **Annual audit updates**
 - **Conflict of interest forms**
- Collected at **various times**, sometimes **multiple times**
- Entity Information typically **not maintained centrally**
 - Some have gone electronic, but only allow one person to complete form or other limitations





Germination and Flowering ..

~2004 – A133
Database

2012 FCOI
Clearinghouse
(currently 1111
Institutions)

**2013 Expanded
Clearinghouse
Original Working
Group**

- Institution Profile
- F&A Rate
- Audit/Financial Questionnaire
- Risk Assessment

Uniform Guidance
Temporary hiatus as
we figured out how
subrecipient
monitoring changed
under the UG

2015 Expanded
Clearinghouse
Reignites





Background and Purpose

- The FDP Executive Committee approved the following goals for the 18 month Pilot:
 - To develop a standard FDP entity profile, initially in Excel, for Pilot entities to complete, certify, update and maintain entity related information about their organization on the FDP website
 - To transition all Excel profiles to a single web-based repository for FDP Pilot entities (and potentially others) to enter, certify, update and maintain entity related information about their organization
 - To develop additional tools, such as the sample Letter of Intent, to allow Pilot entities to easily collect project specific information
 - To collect and analyze data on subrecipient activity and use of the Expanded Clearinghouse to determine administrative burden reduction and ease of use



Phases of Pilot

Complete

- **Phase I**

- Eliminate use of subrecipient commitment forms in favor of a national online repository
- Test whether a data repository is feasible, and whether it effectively reduces the data collection and review burden for pass-through entities and subrecipients alike, while still ensuring stewardship over federal funding.

Complete

- **Phase II**

- Create a more robust web-based system to house entity profiles
- Web-based system to allow for real-time updates, secure certification of information, and ease of use for both clearinghouse participants and others looking for up to date information

In
Progress

- **Post-Pilot (Phase III)**

- Enhance web-based system by adding an application programming interface (API) to enable institutions to pull clearinghouse data directly into their systems
- Add a “financial questionnaire” that can be completed by non-single audit organizations, and paving the way for being able to add these non-single audit organizations to the Clearinghouse



Pilot Success Criteria

1. Participants can efficiently and accurately complete the Entity Profile template.
2. Entity Profile forms are certified to be accurate by authorized institutional officials.
3. Entity Profile templates are posted in a timely manner and easily accessed on the FDP website.
4. Participants routinely access and use the Entity Profile to obtain annual/static information needed for subaward issuance or modification.
5. Participants are able to update their Entity Profile forms efficiently, and do so at least one time per year.
6. Participants determine that access to the Expanded Clearinghouse is more efficient than sharing of individual Subaward Commitment forms.



Phase II – Web-based System

- Converted Entity Profile into web-based system
- Cohorts 1 & 2 entered info into system as part of testing
- Added Cohort 3

Grouping	Go-Live	Mechanism(s)	# FDP Member Organizations (Profiles)	Running Total # FDP Member Organizations (Profiles)
Cohort 1*	3/28/16	Excel -> Online	40 (51)	40 (51)
Cohort 2	8/18/16	Excel -> Online	39(76)	79 (127)
Cohort 3	7/07/17	Online Only	32 (37)	111 (164)
Remaining FDP members	Prior to 12/31/2017	Online Only	43 (TBD)	154 (TBD)



Phase 2 – Web-based system

- [Fdpclearinghouse.org](http://fdpclearinghouse.org)



- **Resources**

- At system home page & ECWG webpage
 - http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055835
- **System Help Page**
 - System Instructions
 - Web demo
 - Business Use Agreement



Key elements of system

- Dropdown Menus
- Warnings/Immediate Data Validation
- Flexible Navigation / Work-in-Progress Saves
- System User Accounts and security
- Separation of Duties (Profile creation/certification/FDP Approval)
- Automated Workflow
- FDP Admin Functions:
 - Reports help identify obsolete data
 - Information on fields changed (for re-reviews)
 - Assignment of profiles to individual admin staff (Co-Chairs)
 - FDP Expanded Clearinghouse Help Desk
 - FDP Admin review (final profile review to enhance integrity)



Evaluation Data and Outcomes



Satisfaction Survey

Overall, I am satisfied with the rollout of the Expanded Clearinghouse web-based system:

98.6% Agree or Strongly Agree

Also **89-98%** satisfaction with:

- General usability & user interface
- Intuitive process for entering, updating and certifying a profile
- Relevant and appropriate data elements
- (Cohort 3) the off-line Organizational Worksheet for collecting data locally before entering on-line.



Time to Complete On-line Profile

- 77% of respondents took less than one hour
- 91% took less than 90 minutes

Amount Of Time	% of Total Responses
0-30 minutes	30%
31-60 minutes	47%
61-90 minutes	14%
91-120 minutes	5%
121-50 minutes	3%
151-180 minutes	1%



Frequency of Use (127 piloteers)

16 month duration of pilot:

11,486 transactions

Last 12 months:

10,830 transactions

20% of institutions had no transactions

65% of institutions had 1-200 transactions

15% had more than 200 transactions

Subaward Actions	Number of Institutions	Percent of Total
0	26	20%
1-100	68	53%
100-200	15	12%
200-300	4	3%
300-400	9	7%
400-500	2	2%
500-600	1	1%
600-700	3	2%



Did the Clearinghouse Actually Save Time?

16 month duration of pilot:	19,401 hours saved
Last 12 months:	17,562 hours saved

Time Saved = 1.62 hours/transaction



Average Time Saved

All Institutions:

# of Entities	Used as PTE	Used as Sub	Total Hours Saved	Average Hours Saved Per Institution	Average Hours Saved Per Year
127	6,258	6,259	19,401	153	153

Institutions
With more than
25 transactions:

# of Entities	Used as PTE	Used as Sub	Total Hours Saved	Average Hours Saved Per Institution	Average Hours Saved Per Year
66	5,975	5,236	17,562	266	266



Imputed Time Saved (Sample)

How much time could be saved if all of an institution's subaward transactions could be done using the Clearinghouse?

Institution	% of Subaward Transactions (as PTE) in the EC	Total Transactions in the EC	Total Subawards as PTE	Annual Time savings for transactions handled in the Clearinghouse (1.62 hours/transaction)	Imputed Annual time savings if 100% of subaward transactions were handled in the Clearinghouse
University of Minnesota	27.7%	321	1160	520 hours	1,879 hours (.9 FTE)
University of Washington	38.3%	334	871	541 hours	1,411 hours (.7 FTE)



Subaward Transaction Detail

Subaward Type:

Action Type	Percent
Modification	50.93%
New Subaward	34.29%
Unknown	12.35%
Proposal	2.43%

Subaward Award Purpose:

Prime Award Type	Percent
Grant	80.59%
Cooperative Agreement	10.96%
Contract	6.13%
Other	1.37%
Unknown	0.96%



Subaward Transaction Detail (continued)

Subaward Prime Sponsor:

Prime Sponsor	Subaward Actions	Percent
DHHS	7,102	61.83%
Private	1,485	12.93%
Other Federal	1,100	9.58%
DOD	728	6.34%
NSF	708	6.16%
Unknown	193	1.68%
State/Local	170	1.48%
Grand Total	11,486	100.00%



Subaward Detail (continued)

Subaward Costing Mechanism

Subaward Type	Percent
Cost Reimbursement	91.01%
Fixed Price	4.04%
Unknown	3.53%
Other	1.43%



Top 10 Heavy Hitters!

Institution	Actions Recorded as PTE	Entity Profile Used as PTE	Entity Profile Used as Subrecipient
Massachusetts General Hospital	669	0	133
Brigham and Women's Hospital	662	0	94
Harvard University	647	0	68
Johns Hopkins University	518	0	230
University of Michigan	447	0	202
University of California, San Francisco	429	429	211
University of Washington	387	385	240
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	372	368	169
Duke University	360	253	192
University of California, Los Angeles	328	112	166



Geography mattered!

Pairs of institutions with the most activity:

Institutional Combinations	Subaward Actions
Vanderbilt University & Vanderbilt University Medical Center	289
Brigham and Women's Hospital & Massachusetts General Hospital	206
Brigham and Women's Hospital & Harvard University	153
Duke University & University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	145
Harvard University & Massachusetts General Hospital	143
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute & Massachusetts General Hospital	110
Stanford University & University of California, San Francisco	102
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute & Harvard University	90
University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc. & University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute, Inc.	77
Brigham and Women's Hospital & Dana-Farber Cancer Institute	75
University of California, Los Angeles & University of California, San Francisco	71
Brigham and Women's Hospital & Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health	70



Geography Mattered (continued)

Pairs of locations with the most activity:

City Combinations	Subaward Actions
Boston, MA & Cambridge, MA	651
Boston, MA & Boston, MA	425
Nashville, TN & Nashville, TN	289
Chapel Hill, NC & Durham, NC	145
New York, NY & New York, NY	127
Baltimore, MD & Boston, MA	113
San Francisco, CA & Stanford, CA	102
Boston, MA & New York, NY	87
Fairway, KS & Lawrence, KS	77
Los Angeles, CA & San Francisco, CA	72
Baltimore, MD & Baltimore, MD	70
Portland, OR & Seattle, WA	68



Pilot Resources (Phase I and II)

- Vanderbilt University Medical Center = ~\$57,000 (donated)
 - System development
- University of Washington = ~ 10,000 (donated)
 - Work study student project assistance and support
- FDP = \$7,882.97
 - Github account, Cloudways development space, fdpclearinghouse.org domain name, initial exploratory meeting at VUMC, developer travel to FDP meetings for demo's, training and support of the Pilot



Phase III – Post Pilot

- System Enhancement
 - Continued work on Enhancement List generated over last few months
 - Automated Program Interface (API)
 - Financial Questionnaire
- Preparations for additional Participating Orgs – added one by one and NOT in Cohorts/batches



6 Recommendations to FDP Executive Committee

- **RECOMMENDATION 1:** Invite the remainder of FDP to join, on a one-by-one basis at whatever point of time they wish, from September 15, 2017 – December 31, 2017. **APPROVED**
- **RECOMMENDATION 2:** At the start of the next FDP phase, make participation in the Expanded Clearinghouse mandatory for FDP members. **UNDER CONSIDERATION**
- **RECOMMENDATION 3:** For a fee, invite non-FDP members who are also single audit recipients to join beginning October 1, 2017, on a one-by-one basis. **UNDER CONSIDERATION. AT MINIMUM DATE WILL MOVE TO 2018**



6 Recommendations to FDP Executive Committee

- **RECOMMENDATION 4:** At a future time and for a fee, invite non-FDP members who are not single audit recipients to join the Expanded Clearinghouse on a one-by-one basis.
FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION
- **RECOMMENDATION 5:** Allow the FDP Executive Committee to determine use of revenue from non-members to support (in priority order) maintenance, enhancements and other FDP pilots or projects **FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION**
- **RECOMMENDATION 6:** Allow FDP Expanded Clearinghouse working group to continue their development and enhancement work. **PENDING APPROVAL**



Resources

- ECWG Webpage
 - http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055835
- FDP Clearinghouse web-based system
 - <http://fdpclearinghouse.org/>
- Helpdesk
 - fdpechelp@gmail.com



Continued Thanks to a Great Team!

WORKGROUP MEMBERS

Lynette Arias (Co-Chair)	University of Washington
Jennifer Barron (Co-Chair)	Johns Hopkins University
Pamela Webb (Co-Chair)	University of Minnesota
Patrice Carroll	Brown University
Marcy Friedle	Florida State University
Rebecca Balentine	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
Julie Thatcher	Institute for Systems Biology (ERI)
Amanda Hamaker	Purdue University
Gloria Greene/ Steve Parker	University of Alabama, Huntsville
Jennifer Rodis	University of Wisconsin-Madison
Sara Clough	UT Austin
Courtney Swaney	UT Austin
Robert Prentiss	UT Austin
Tyra Patrice Darville-Layne	Northwestern University
Christopher Renner	Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Michael Johnson	Vanderbilt University Medical Center



Lulu Sun
UW Work
study student





Questions & Discussion

- All feedback, comments, questions and praise - please use

fdpechelp@gmail.com





Co-Chair Contact Info

- Lynette Arias
 - University of Washington
 - ariasl@uw.edu
- Pamela Webb
 - University of Minnesota
 - pwebb@umn.edu
- Jennifer Barron
 - Johns Hopkins University
 - jlb@jhu.edu





Team Selfie

