

FDP Meeting Summary – May 23-24, 2005, National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC

Opening Plenary – Kathie Olsen, Associate Director for Science, Office of Science and Technology Policy

Kathie Olsen's slides are posted at http://www.thefdp.org/Present16_May2005.pdf.

Kathie Olsen provided an update on 1) priorities and perspectives from the Executive Office of the President, 2) directions for research funding and 3) activities of the Research Business Models (RBM) Subcommittee. Kathie recognized the work of all the members of the RBM subcommittee including Geoff Grant, Rod Brown, USDA, and Connie Atwell. OSTP works hard on getting all the research agencies to work together. One of the questions that was asked during Kathie's last meeting with the FDP (May 2003) was whether the RBM activity would last and how effective would it be. The RBM Subcommittee is a standing National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) subcommittee. Another issue discussed at the May 2003 meeting was how to find a policy home for the Federal Demonstration Partnership. Since then, Dr. Nat Pitts has been named as the OSTP liaison with the FDP. OSTP is intent on moving grants streamlining initiatives tested and developed by the FDP into implementation. FDP activities are reported back to the research agency heads through the Committee on Science (chaired by Dr. Zerhouni, NIH, and Dr. Bement, NSF).

2006 Research Budget – Science budgets come from the domestic discretionary budget and in 2006 the R&D budget is 13.6% of the domestic discretionary budget (the highest percentage since 1968). One area of concern for OSTP is as the total discretionary budget decreases that they continue to make effective arguments for maintaining a high percentage for the R&D share. OSTP will continue to fight for the R&D share with strong arguments and why it's important to invest in R&D. There is a new appropriation subcommittee structure that encompasses Science, Commerce and Justice. This is important since "science" is now in the name. One area of interest is that now many of the science agencies will be competing within the same appropriation subcommittee. There are strong supporters of science on the subcommittee. There are positive signs that science budgets will do fine within the appropriation subcommittee. OSTP is now working on the 2007 budget request. Each agency requests a budget that sustains the importance to its mission and beyond that OSTP looks at activities that cross agencies and these are identified as priorities. The priority process is both top down and bottom up. NSF and NIH in particular get a lot of their ideas from their community. Strategic planning in this process is very important. OSTP gets their input from the private sector through the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology and from the government sector through the NSTC.

NSTC Subcommittee Initiatives

- Subcommittee on Earth Observations – Global Earth Observations System of Systems is a whole new way of thinking about earth observations. A strategic plan was released in April 2005. A big area of interagency coordination.
- Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality – strategic plan being developed and will be conducting regional workshops to gather input. Need broad participation particularly from universities. A Federal Register notice will be issued in June 2005 announcing the workshops. Please contact OSTP if a university is willing to host a regional workshop.
- Working Group on Export Controls for S&T
- Research Business Models Subcommittee

Research Business Subcommittee

- Intent is to maximize business practices in order to maximize scientific investment return.

- In January, OSTP endorsed 3 initiatives recommended by the subcommittee: multiple PI's on research grants, adoption of FDP subaward agreement and adoption of FDP standard terms and conditions government-wide.
- Continuing progress is being made on standard research progress reports, enhanced A-133 compliance supplement on subrecipient monitoring and model support for operations and maintenance of research instrumentation.
- Interdisciplinary case studies and best practices are being developed under an RBM toolkit.

Task Group on Export Controls – OSTP is giving the highest attention to this issue. This is in response to the Department of Commerce IG report recommending changes to the language regulating deemed exports (see FDP export controls page at http://www.thefdp.org/Deemed_Export_Issues.html). OSTP is coordinating responses from science agencies from the perspective of grant funders as well as federal laboratories. It is essential that the community respond to this Federal Register notice (deadline June 27, 2005).

Other initiatives at NSTC

- Biomedical Applications of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology
- Prion Science
- Disaster Reduction Research (Early tsunami warning systems)
- Obesity Research
- Still working on the Visa problems but making progress.

Kathie ended by thanking the FDP for being a laboratory for innovation and preserving a dialogue between the university community and the federal government. Without the FDP, there wouldn't have been the early results from the RBM subcommittee.

Comment: The export control issue has a huge impact on the university. Universities are forced to adopt a conservative compliance approach for fear of non-compliance problems in the future. It's important for universities to send responses to the Federal Register notice particularly letters from faculty members.

Response: OSTP has developed a strong working relationship with Department of Commerce. They have had joint site visits to Stanford University and the NIH campus to review the impact of these proposed changes on fundamental research activities. Comments from the university community are very important. Industry is also sending responses because of the impact on their R&D activities.

Question: What is happening at OSTP to look at activities that would make science more appealing in the K-12 range?

Response: OSTP is working closely with NSF and Department of Education. There are number of issues. You need to start with the teachers, pay them more, and make sure they are qualified to teach math and science. You need teachers who understand mathematics and science. This is not just a US issue but has a global impact. From the statistics, 35% of incoming college freshman indicate their interest in majoring in mathematics and science but only 15% eventually receive a degree in those fields. You need to look at K-12, undergraduate and graduate training. Science and engineering training provides a good background for all types of career fields.

Question: The FDP faculty appreciate the progress made on Visa processing problems. However, the emphasis may shift to re-establishing the US as a welcoming place for foreign students.

We're worried that the quality of students coming to the US is dropping off. What's the perspective on re-establishing the US as a place where the top foreign students come to study?

Response: Other countries are capitalizing on the opportunity to attract foreign students who might have studied in the US. OSTP is coordinating with the State Department as well as OECD, UNESCO, etc. Universities and professional societies need to get the message out. The US is in competition for the best foreign students.

Update on Government-wide Implementation of FDP Terms and Conditions, Beth Phillips, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget

The RBM Subcommittee has endorsed the use of FDP standard terms and conditions government-wide. This would expand their use to allow the FDP terms and conditions to be applied to awards made by non-FDP federal agencies and to non-FDP recipients. Jean Feldman, NSF, and Mark Herbst, DOD, were tasked with coordinating this expanded use with non-FDP agencies. Phase 2 of this effort is to develop a government-wide set of standard terms and conditions (under the PL 106-107 working groups) but this will take longer to develop and implement across the federal agencies. In January, a request for comments on adopting the FDP terms and conditions was published in the Federal Register. OMB received comments from 23 entities: 6 federal agencies, 11 universities, 3 non-profit research institutions and 3 associations. These responses yielded 122 different comments that are being analyzed. The overall response was extremely positive. After the comments are analyzed, there will be a Federal Register notice announcing the implementation. The RBM web site published only the FDP standard terms and conditions. Federal agencies needed to see the exact language of any additional terms and conditions proposed for government-wide use. When the final research general terms and conditions are published, there will be 2 companion notices proposing the language in the national policy requirements and the subaward matrix. A grants governance committee has been formed by the Chief Financial Officers Council and chaired by Tom Cooley, NSF. This committee will ensure that the grants policy aspects are considered.

The grants policy documents have been moved into the Code of Federal Regulations (2CFR). In May 2004, the OMB Circular A-110 was moved to the 2CFR. The cost principle circulars will also be moving to the 2CFR. The ultimate goal is to have a single place for OMB circulars and the agency implementation documents. Suspension/debarment guidance will also move to 2CFR.

Questions: Have concerns been raised by federal agencies about adopting the FDP terms and conditions government-wide?

Response: No, the changes are mostly editing and language changes.

Question: Have you thought about how to keep the terms and conditions up to date?

Response: This was discussed at the Terms and Conditions standing committee meeting and OMB would like the FDP to continue to maintain the terms and conditions at least for another year.

Advanced Research Instrumentation Panel

Moderator: Bill Olbricht, Cornell University

Panelists: Debbie Stine, Associate Director, Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy (COSEPUP), National Academy of Sciences; Mark Oreglia, University of Chicago; Mark Lively, Wake Forest University School of Medicine; and Sangtae Kim, National Science Foundation

Bill Olbricht introduced the panel. The panel grew out of the meeting in Las Vegas from a session sponsored by the Research Business Models Subcommittee (Nat Pitts and Geoff Grant) to take a look at some of the issues when faculty require new instrumentation in the conduct of their research and labs. It's a difficult issue that involves not just the acquisition but also the continuing maintenance and operation of the equipment. The panel will provide varying perspectives on this topic.

Debbie Stine, COSEPUP. (See slides at http://www.thefdp.org/Present13_May2005.pdf.)

In the past year, COSEPUP published 2 related reports: 1) Setting Priorities for NSF's Large Research Facilities and 2) Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research. The Committee on Advanced Research Instrumentation is chaired by Martha Krebs. The current study came from the NSF

Authorization Act of 2002 that instructed NSF to request the National Academy of Sciences to assess the need for an interagency program to establish and support fully equipped, state-of-the-art university-based centers for interdisciplinary research and advanced instrumentation development. The study is divided into 6 questions: 1) what are the current programs and policies of the major federal research agencies for advanced research instrumentation (involves instrumentation in the range of \$2 Million to greater than \$100 Million and also includes cyberstructure as well as social sciences); 2) what is the current status of advanced mid-sized research instrumentation on university campuses; 3) what challenges do federal agencies and universities identify regarding such instruments; 4) would an interagency program to fund mid-size advanced research instruments help respond to these challenges and if so what should be the components; 5) are sufficient federal programs available to develop new mid-sized instruments that respond to research community needs; and 6) what federal policies could be put into place to enhance the designs, building, funding, sharing, operations and maintenance of mid-sized advanced research instruments. The committee started its work in February 2005 and will have the last meeting in June 2005. There were several surveys: institutions, faculty and national labs. The surveys asked questions related to 1) do institutions have instruments in the mid-size range (\$2M-\$100M); 2) if no federal funding were available, is the need great enough that funding should be diverted from research grants to instruments; and 3) what kinds of instruments in this range will be needed 5 years from now. The final report is expected by September 2005. One survey was sent to FDP faculty and Debbie would be interested in any thoughts and comments on the study.

Mark Oreglia, University of Chicago. Mark solicited comments from the University of Chicago faculty prior to this meeting and received 8 indicating that this is a topic of significant interest to research faculty. Getting the equipment is the easy part but funding operations and maintenance can be more difficult. There are 3 categories of advanced research instrumentation: 1) equipment from a few thousand to several hundreds of thousands of dollars (operations and maintenance funding can be included in purchase); 2) equipment from \$500K-\$1M (this equipment must be shared among groups and repair costs are more expensive); and 3) above \$10M (must be a shared use facility). Each category has common problems: it's easier to buy new equipment than repair old equipment. Site infrastructure costs must be funded by the university and this can be a problem in the era of shrinking budgets. Technical operator salaries and training is often not allowed by funding agencies. Contingency is also a non-allowable cost. No depreciation is allowed by the agencies. One solution is cost recovery where you charge users. The rule of thumb is that you can only recover 80% of the costs. The university must cover the 20% shortfall. Universities are careful about which projects to fund in order to budget for this shortfall. The creation of an agency funded center can alleviate some of the problems but at a cost of increased administrative burden, higher use fees and only effective for larger instruments and still no depreciation is allowed. Sometimes universities can appeal to private philanthropic organizations for funding. NSF's shared instrument grants have relaxed some of the rules but often take 2 years to implement and may not be useful for cutting edge equipment that is needed immediately. There appear to be few standard solutions across disciplines. The FDP could play a big role in discussing and promoting best practices across member institutions. It would be helpful if funding agencies would relax some of the requirements to address obvious problems. Universities can create and promote shared use facilities for use in interdisciplinary research.

Mark Lively, Wake Forest University and representing the Association of Biomolecular Resource Facilities (ABRF). Many universities have shared resource facilities and many of the facilities involve instruments in the less than \$2M range. From the biological sciences perspective, getting the instruments is becoming more difficult. While the NIH budget for investigator initiated awards has increased over the last several years, the funding for instrumentation has remained stable for the last 10 years while the demand has increased. The instruments involved here are beyond those procured as part of a single research grant award. The way to solve this problem is to procure these instruments as part of a shared resource facility. ABRF (abrf.org) is an international organization representing universities, government and the pharmaceutical industry. The NIH shared instrumentation grant program provides funding in

the range of \$100K to \$2M. These are instruments that are way too costly to obtain directly from an NIH grant. The average instrument is shared by 8-10 researchers and individual researchers must already be funded by an NIH grant for their area of research. The key to the instrumentation grant is will it support the funded science. In 2004, NIH funding was \$66M, .2% of the NIH budget. The next issue is the continuing support. There is no mechanism for continued support, for salary support for the technicians who keep the instruments running. We would urge that something needs to be done to address these continuing support issues (support contracts can run as much 8-10% of purchase price). Those are the issues that ABRF considers. ABRF also has committees that address the practices of the shared facilities in order to share best practices and to make the facilities more cost effective.

Sangtae Kim, Director, Division of Shared Cyberinfrastructure, National Science Foundation

Dr. Kim discussed the instrumentation challenges in the context of computational infrastructure. There is a parallel between how computational infrastructure is acquired and the major research instrumentation. The process for funding and creating computational infrastructure is the same mechanism as major research instrumentation awards. One comment I hear is that terabytes of data are created per day but we harness only kilobytes of knowledge per month. The bottlenecks are the strategies for storing and managing the data in a distributed environment. There are great challenges on software solutions like middleware and the data mining capabilities to access the data. This is a very intense area of research. One of our challenges is to support these other areas of research in addition to the ongoing support of high end computing. We also need to think about data preservation strategies for preserving the most important documents and information in a digital environment. Much of this is stored in email systems and we don't have a digital preservation strategy for access to this information. Consistent with the comments about funding instrumentation maintenance and support, this is also true in the case of cyberinfrastructure, not only hardware but also software. By working across all the scientific disciplines, the shared cyberinfrastructure effort is in a good position to transfer good ideas on processes and best practices from one scientific community to another.

Question: There appear to be a lot of arbitrary guidelines in these funding programs particularly dollar cost guidelines that may be inefficient. You also cannot get funding to maintain or refurbish equipment. Instrumentation is often translated to equipment. There are areas of infrastructure that are hard to fund, below the levels of the research instrumentation grant programs. An example is acquiring equipment involved in testing the impact of technology on individuals. Do you have any suggestions for addressing this situation?

Answer: Dr. Kim indicated that one approach is through unsolicited proposals to his division. This works when the area of research doesn't fit exactly within one of the research instrumentation solicitations. You need to convince the program manager that this approach deploys infrastructure. Dr. Lively indicated that if the funding thresholds for NIH shared instrumentation grant program dropped too low then the types of instruments requested would be mundane. There is a gap below \$100K down to around \$30K where it's hard to get funding. So what you do is to boost the budget to get it up to \$100K to get into the SIG program. This doesn't work well. The review panel will adjust the request to fund what's actually needed. The real challenge at NSF and NIH is to determine how many instruments can be funded with the current funding levels. The level of need is greater than the current available funding.

Question: From a medical school perspective, some of the real instrumentation costs are in the software, particularly software upgrades. There are also challenges to managing the research instrumentation. Finding funding to keep individuals who can manage the instrumentation is also a challenge. It would be good to get more institutional funding but it appears that the funding will have to come from other sources.

Response: Dr. Oreglia noted that the software is a real issue but often there is ancillary software that can be used by multiple facilities where group purchases can provide efficiencies. Dr. Lively noted that one of the ABRF issues is career development, promotion and tenure for individuals managing instrumentation facilities. While doing facility management, these individuals do not

have the time to run individual research activities but their productivity is measured in traditional ways (number of grants, publications, etc.). Facility management requires special skills and must involve PhD scientists and faculty level positions.

Question: Is the instrumentation price range in the COSEPUP study \$2M - \$10M? Are closely related instruments used in the core facility in the price range of the study?

Answer: The range can extend up to \$100M. The report lays out instrumentation and why it's important regardless of costs. Some of these issues apply to all instrumentation regardless of capital cost. The committee has also heard comments about the problem of rewarding technical staff in management instrumentation facilities and would like feedback and suggestions of programs that could help in this process.

Question: At the last FDP meeting, we also talked about the possibility of catastrophic problems. This could be as a result of a natural disaster like hurricanes and earthquakes. Is that going to be looked at a national level or is it that relegated to states and universities?

Comment: This could also include less catastrophic problems such as electric outages.

Response: Dr. Stine responded that she wasn't aware of any national focus but thought that this could be a good topic at a future FDP meeting.

Discussion on recent NAS study, "Policy Implications: International Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars in the United States"

Laurel L. Haak, Study Director, Committee on Policy Implications of International Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Scholars in the US

See slides at http://www.thefdp.org/Present14_May2005.pdf.

Laure Haak provided background on the recent National Academies report on international graduate students and postdoctoral students. The report was released on May 10th. There has been good reception to this report. The committee had an extensive charge and there wasn't a lot of data and it was challenging to meet the charge. The charge was to evaluate: 1) impact on the advancement of US science, national security and international relations; 2) impact of the US academic system on intellectual development, careers and perception of the US; 3) impact of enrollment on the recruitment of domestic S&E talent; 4) working conditions compared with domestic counterparts; and 5) policies that reshape the flow of international students and postdoctoral scholars. The bottom line was: 1) to maintain and extend its excellence in science and engineering, the US must recruit the most talented people worldwide for positions in academia, industry and government; 2) to do this, the nation must attract the best international talent while seeking to improve training of its own S&E students, including women and members of underrepresented minority groups; and 3) this dual goal is especially important in light of global competition for the best S&E student and scholars.

Report Recommendations

Recommendation 1-1

- Maintain or enhance current S&E quality and effectiveness
- Attract the best graduate students and postdoctoral scholars regardless of national origin
- Encourage domestic-student interest in S&E programs and careers

Recommendation 1-2 to University Faculty

- Provide the highest – quality training and career development
- Keep in mind career and employment opportunities when making admissions decisions
- Make employment outcomes data available

Recommendation 2-1 to Universities

- Encourage enrollment of international students by offering fellowships and assistantships
- Evaluate existing student and scholar services
- Offer orientation days, train teaching assistants, update Web services, and provide for training for administrators staffing international student and scholar offices.

Recommendation 2-2

- International postdocs are a large and growing proportion of the US S&E workforce, but no systematic data
- A high priority should be placed on collecting and disseminating data on demographics, working conditions, and career outcomes of postdoctoral scholars
- Funds should be allocated for this purpose to the NSF or other organizations

Recommendation 3-1 to Universities, Federal Agencies and Foundations

- Provide prospective students with information on career outcomes of recent graduates
- Offer graduate students training in research and diverse career skills
- Provide early-career transition grants
- Encourage women and members of underrepresented minorities in S&E

Recommendation 4-1

- The United States should develop a new system of data collection to track student and postdoctoral flows to understand dynamics and effects of shifting sources of talent

Recommendation 4-2

- Visa and immigration policies should provide clear procedures that do not unnecessarily hinder the flow of international graduate students and postdocs
- New regulations should be carefully considered in light of national-security considerations and potential unintended consequences
- Specific Policy Recommendations
 1. Departments of State and Homeland Security should continue efforts to extend visa durations for students and scholars from all countries
 2. Travel to scientific meetings should be facilitated for international graduate students and postdoctoral scholars at US institutions
 3. The Technology Alert List should be reviewed regularly by scientists and engineers outside government; scientifically trained personnel should be involved in security reviews
 4. New visa categories should be created for nonimmigrant doctoral-level graduate students and postdoctoral scholars (the categories should be exempt from the 214b "intent to immigrate" provision)
 5. Reciprocity agreements on multiple-entry and multiple-year student visas should have high priority in negotiations. Change of status procedures should be clarified and streamlined.

Report Conclusion

The conclusion of the report stated that maintaining and strengthening the S&E enterprise of the United States, particularly by attracting the best domestic and international graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, will require the cooperation of government, universities, and industry to agree on an appropriate balance between openness, mobility, and economic and national security.

Copies of the report can be requested by sending an email with address information to fdp@nas.edu.

Federal Agency and FDP Committee/Task Force Reports

Federal Agency Updates

National Institutes of Health (Joe Ellis) There have been some new additions to the Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration (OPERA): Tim Hays, eRA Policy Liaison and Scientific Advisor; Cynthia Dwyer, Assistant Grants Policy Officer; and J.P. Kim, invention reporting. Marcia Hahn has been selected as the Director of the Division of Grants Policy in OPERA.

National Science Foundation (Joanna Rom) NSF has conducted a number of outreach sessions and slides are on the NSF web site

(<http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/guidance.jsp#outreach>). New assistant directors in Biological Sciences and Education and Human Resources are being recruited. NSF is continuing to work with Grants.gov. Last summer, GAO looked into science agencies compliance with Title IX section on protections against sexual discrimination of students and employees of institutions receiving federal funds. GAO recommended a more proactive approach to compliance reviews. There will be more information about this in the future. NSF is also looking at the risk based model for award monitoring.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (Monique Sullivan) Tom Suaret retired from NASA. Monique is new to FDP.

Environmental Protection Agency (Jack Puzak) EPA has been instituting new policies and procedures for grant applications. None of the new procedures affect applications from academic institutions. All EPA announcements are now available through Grants.gov so applications can be submitted electronically through that site. EPA will continue to accept paper applications directly to EPA. Graduate fellowship applications will be submitted through Grants.gov. This announcement should be posted shortly. The closing date will be moved up to the middle of October 2005.

FDP Committee/Task Force Reports

(See slides at http://www.thefdp.org/Present15_May2005.pdf)

Membership Committee (Joanna Rom, National Science Foundation) The committee has issued a policy statement (approved by Executive Committee) on institutional compliance with the FDP memorandum of agreement (meeting attendance, participation, payment of dues). The committee is looking into the next stages of FDP and what that means for membership. Southern Illinois University Edwardsville is the newest emerging research institution (ERI) member. There have been discussions with North Carolina Central University about joining as an ERI member. The committee has been working with Merrilea Mayo, Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), on a project to address administrative burdens for ERI member institutions. The committee is making plans for the biennial membership reports that will be submitted in the fall.

Terms and Conditions Standing Committee (Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology, and Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation) Updates to the standard terms and conditions and agency specific requirements have been posted to the website. The FDP general terms and conditions were updated in April 2005. The following agency specific requirements have been updated: EPA – February 2005; NASA – January 2005; and USDA-CSREES – February 2005. The national policy matrix was updated in February 2005. The committee discussed Article 54 – Reporting Classifiable Information. Questions were raised about the appropriateness of including this article in the general terms and conditions. Federal agency representatives will consult with their agency staff to determine if this article needs to be addressed and whether it belongs in the general terms and conditions. There continues to be great interest in the committee activities and the meetings are well attended. When an FDP agency plans to update the agency specific requirements, the agency representative presents the changes to the committee for discussion by both agencies and institutions. There was some discussion about the future of the committee pending the government-wide adoption of the FDP terms and conditions. There was a strong belief by committee members (particularly institutional members) that the importance of the committee was the open dialogue and that should continue.

Allocation of Space Costs (Mike Anthony, University of California at San Francisco) The committee has spent some time justifying that the default methodologies for allocating space related costs (OMB Circular A-21) were not adequate and were inequitable. ONR and MIT have volunteered to do a pilot on primary use of space. Any ONR schools are welcome to participate. The working group's goal is to find an effective way to allocate the space related costs. The working group is looking for schools that have recently negotiated an indirect cost rate to get

information on a “factor” approach to space costs. Please contact Tim Reuter, University of Cincinnati. The working group will be contacting Paul Nacon, recently announced as National Director, DHHS/Division for Cost Allocation, to encourage his personal participation.

Contracts Task Force (Samuela Evans, University of California-Systemwide, and Paul Powell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology) The task force discussed some contracting issues with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). This includes the requirement for information technology security clearances and some intellectual property requirement language. For DOD there has been difficulty in determining sources of funding in order to determine whether restrictions apply. There also have been discussions with DARPA and they have started to include source of funding in the broad area announcements (BAA). The task force is trying to develop a better understanding of how the Department of Homeland Security plans to handle contracts. DHS seems to be adopting the DARPA contracting model. The task force is exploring the possibility of developing a master contract template for DOD contracts. The task force has produced a list of Department of Energy labs that are not using the model language.

Finance Standing Committee (Kim Moreland, University of Wisconsin-Madison) The committee has been working with the Executive Committee and Merrilea Mayo (Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable) to stabilize the financing for the FDP Executive Director position. Regarding the FDP budget (federal funding to GUIRR), the expenditures are in line with the FDP budget projections. For the institutional dues funds, the committee is continuing to make progress on a contingency fund (3 years of operational costs). A working group has been established to explore alternatives for investing a portion of the dues fund in an interest bearing account. Great progress has been made on collection of dues for this year (2004-2005). We will follow-up with 2 institutions. The committee recommended that the dues payment amount remain the same for next year. For the next dues cycle, paper invoices will be sent to each institution with the hopes that this will reduce the number of misdirected payments. The committee endorsed the initiative to implement credit card processing for meeting registration payments starting with the September meeting.

Electronic Research Standing Committee (Steve Dowdy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology) On March 25th, representatives from the committee met with Grants.gov and other agency representatives to open a dialogue with Grants.gov and OMB on implementation issues. There will be a follow-up meeting after the FDP meeting and plan on having future meetings. Some of the issues are problems with organizational registration (Dun and Bradstreet numbers (DUNS) and Central Contractor Registry (CCR)) and the various transactions using this process; and exploring the issues around faculty profiles (utilizing work done by the FDP). The committee heard presentations on Grants.gov update, agency implementation plans and system-to-system exchange update.

Administrative Process Standing Committee (Tim Reuter, University of Cincinnati) The committee has been organized along the grants lifecycle (pre-award, post-award and audit). The committee is looking for increased participation from the federal agency representatives. The primary focus will be the results coming from the grants streamlining of the PL 106-107 working groups and the Research Business Models Subcommittee.

Faculty Standing Committee (Gilda Barabino, Northeastern University, and Joe Konstan, University of Minnesota) The committee has stepped up the mentoring of new faculty attending the meetings. The committee has worked hard on ensuring faculty participation in all FDP activities not just attending faculty sessions. The committee heard a talk on visa issues from a staffer from Senator Norm Coleman’s office. The faculty participated in a joint session with ERI members on best practices in payroll and effort certification. The faculty committee is re-launching efforts to explore improvements in the peer review cycle. The committee is also initiating outreach to scientific professional societies to raise the visibility of FDP activities. In September, the Principal Investigator (PI) administrative burden survey will be launched. The

major key to success is to identify the survey sample of federally funded PI's (during 2004-2005) at FDP institutions. This will be an opportunity for administrative and faculty representatives to work together to ensure maximum participation. The initial contact with administrative representatives with detailed instructions will be sent in June.

Basic Assistance Grants Task Force (Sue Ross, Northwestern University) The task force heard from Wally Schaffer, NIH, on the results of the review of the NIH modular grant application process. The results were generally positive and the hope is that other agencies will adopt the process. The task force developed a list of the budget streamlining objectives and options. The task force is planning to send out a project relatedness survey to FDP institutions.

Payroll Certification (Maureen Joyce, Northeastern University, and Joe Gindhart, Washington University) The working group met with federal representatives on April 4th to discuss payroll certification streamlining. A proposed plain language re-write for OMB Circular A-21 section J.10 was developed. The other outcome was the recommendation to remove the examples from section J.10. During this meeting, there was a spirited discussion on next steps. Gil Tran, OMB, attended and has suggested that he will take the re-write to several government groups to get their views. The working group welcomes ideas on payroll certification streamlining and issues clarification from FDP members.

Financial Reporting (Scott Blackwood, North Carolina State University) The working group heard from Trudy Wood, Department of Energy, on the proposed format for progress reports on research awards (a Research Business Models Subcommittee initiative). Initially, this will be focused on interim progress reports. There will be a Federal Register notice for comments this summer/fall. Last year, there was a comment period on a consolidated federal financial report format. This will undergo another OMB review cycle with federal agencies. The working group asked OMB for an opportunity to review the format and to pilot the new format within the FDP. There is a continued interest in streamlining NIH financial reporting. The working group is looking at institutional best practices for financial closeout to improve timely financial status reports.

Subawards Task Force (Dick Seligman, California Institute of Technology) OMB and OSTP have endorsed the model subagreement for national use. The task force reviewed the draft of the universal model subagreement form. This form will not be made available until the final notice adopting the FDP terms and conditions government-wide is issued. The form will be made available on the FDP web site. The task force has created 3 new subcommittees: foreign subaward template, clinical trials template and guidelines for using the model subaward agreement.

Foundations and Public Charities Task Force (Jay Walton, Johns Hopkins University, and John Carfora, Boston College) The co-chairs will be stepping down after this meeting. The public charities and private foundations have participated in the discussions of the task force and now will be taking over and continuing the work of the task force. The co-chairs thanked the FDP and NCURA for their support. A final report will be provided to the FDP in September.

Final Comments (Nancy Wray, FDP Chair)

The Executive Committee is forming a strategic planning committee to look at what FDP should be going forward into the next phase. The committee is being formed with representation across the FDP and there will be more information provided at the September 2005 meeting.