Topic	University	Proposed Demonstration
A. Electronic Research Administration		
A.1 Cost of Implementation Matrix A.2 Standardization a. Standardization of e-grants Submission by Institutional Officials b. E-progress Report Eliminating Institutional Signature c. Standardize a reporting through web-based portal d. Federal e-award notices, Expiration Notices and Notifications of Reports Due e. Implement Institutional and Professional Profiles A.3 Federal Commons a. Centralized Rolodex b. A Common Web Site Accessing All Active Projects c. A System/ Database for Institutional Assurances & Certifications d. Integration of Government and University systems A.4 Security A.5 Other a. Institutional Systems b. Automated Research Information Administrator (ARIA)-IRB		
A.1	University of Washington	The first project on which we would like to collaborate with other FDP members, is the development of standard metrics to evaluate how the implementation of electronic grants and contracts management systems have impacted administrative processes. Since the University of Washington, like many institutions, is in the process of creating new systems to respond to federal initiatives, it is important for us to be able to show our constituents where this new system has reduced the administrative burden. In addition, we will use these metrics to continue to improve our process so we can further decrease the amount of time a researcher must spend on administrative work, and increase the discovery potential of every federal dollar contributed. By working with other institutions, the creation of standardized metrics would enable us to evaluate our processes against our peers and raise the bar for everyone involved.
A.2	Brown University	A second area that needs to be addressed is that of e-Government and it concerns the many differing agency electronic implementations for similar types of transactions. Three examples are as follows: • Agency 1 has implemented an electronic system for proposal submission where the principal investigator creates a proposal and submits it for internal approval to an authorized official. The authorized official signs the proposal on behalf of the institution and submits it to the grantor agency. • Agency 2 has a system that requires that only the authorized official of the institution may create a proposal. The proposal is submitted immediately and exclusively upon creation by the authorized official of the institution. • Agency 3 has implemented a system that provides that any employee may submit a proposal directly to the federal agency without any evidence of approval or acknowledgement by an authorized official of the institution. Because Agency 1 has implemented a system that mimics actual historic use and current needs of grantee institutions (the citizen users), they have succeeded in creating a more efficient solution that is more accountable and makes it easier for institutions to conduct business. The other two agencies have added unnecessary administrative burdens by creating IT proposal submission systems that were developed and evaluated according to how well they serve the agency's needs and not the submitting user's needs. In order to cope, institutions must develop numerous unique internal procedures for a single type of transaction depending on the specific federal agency. The resulting administrative burden is unnecessary,

		inefficient and costly.
A.2	Case Western Reserve University	As a result of PL 106-107, a number of federal agencies have constructed web sites for electronic submission of grant applications. This increases the workload and time for faculty and administrators who find the same information requested but in different formats. The Federal Commons was developed by the FDP with the goal of a single application procedure for all federal agencies. FDP demonstration(s) designed to achieve this goal should take the opportunity to engage federal agencies in an active effort to provide administrative relief to faculty researchers. In reference to PL 106-107, FDP demonstrations/pilot projects could test streamlining of forms and information requested with each application. In addition, other aspects of research administration, such as, announcement of funding opportunities, Pre-Award, Post-Award, and auditing activities, could be streamlined and tested by FDP demonstrations. The goal of the demonstrations is to establish common electronic standards for proposal/award systems, including standard payment processes, using the Federal Commons as the gateway for electronic business. Each area of eRA can be tested in demonstrations as a module of the Federal Commons. The FDP should focus on identifying and publicizing those demonstrations/pilot projects, which promote the guiding and operating principles of the Presidential Review Directive IV.
A.2	Colorado State	Award announcements using EDI 850 transaction set via xml\
A.2	Columbia University	Columbia University additionally proposes, as part of the FDP Phase IV effort, a demonstration to streamline interim/final reporting submissions in order to respond to the problems of multiple submissions of the same report. Currently, with the exception of a few agencies, notably the NSF and ONR, technical reports are not submitted electronically. The ensuing problem is that Principal Investigators and Sponsored Research Administrators have to spend an enormous amount of time responding to multiple requests from granting agencies for resubmission of reports that were already submitted by mail or email. This is an unnecessary financial and time management burden to all the parties involved: the PI, the institution, and the government. Our proposal is to create a Common Interagency Report Portal (CIRP) to permit authorized users at grantee organizations and granting agency officials to do the following: • . Submit all technical reports (interim, quarterly, annual and final) electronically via a common web portal • Verify that the data transmitted is accurately represented • View completed submission and retrieve report. For the demonstration, we propose that FDP (initially) create the portal by which the pilot institutions can submit their reports. The participating granting agencies, including the agencies serving as the administrators of the grant(s) (i.e. ONR), will then be able to retrieve the reports from the FDP CIRP web site. This will eliminate much of the duplicative data entry as to when a report is submitted and will allow immediate report retrieval. There are existing models to on which to piggyback, e.g., The NIH Interagency Edison, which supports a “Common Face” for Invention Reporting to the Government, FastLane. Like the NIH ERA Commons, this reporting system should be divided into both unrestricted and restricted areas that provide for viewing public and/or confidential information, respectively. The system should allow grantee organizations to submit information formatted according to

		either HTML-formatted or EDI-formatted datastream files. This CIRP demonstration will promote various Federal initiatives focused on standardizing and simplifying Federal arrangement with academic institutions and other organizations that perform Federally supported research and education activities. It will promote efficacy and reduce redundancy, costs, and time. The Principal Investigator will be able to concentrate more completely on his/her research, will be able to devote the desired attention to educating students and will become more productive.
A.2	Cornell University	The FDP Phase III primary focus is on electronic research administration. The eRA Standing Committee has drafted core principles that should be followed during eRA system developments. The Committee has also stressed the importance of adherence to eRA standards. Both the core principles and the standards work need to continue into Phase IV via agency demonstration and pilots. As the majority of agency eRA initiatives start to evolve, we must continue to test such systems using the core principles and standards philosophy as the framework necessary to reach a true "common face" approach to eRA. The benefit of a common face approach is simple. It is the essence of the FDP mission. It is streamlining by reducing administrative burden. It is felt by all: administrators, technical professionals and most importantly, faculty. During the second half of Phase III, P.L. 106-107 was introduced into law. The federal government established four working groups to work on 106-107 initiatives. The pre-award, post-award, audit, and electronic subgroups were formed. Shortly thereafter, the FDP established four mirror groups. The pre-award and electronic groups have been actively working toward their respective charges. In Phase IV heavy concentration in post award and audit needs to occur. Ideas for post-award initiatives include standardizing data elements for inventory, invention and technical reporting as well as continuing the work on cost sharing issues and effort reporting. The audit mirror group could embark on the topic of consistency. Consistency within the audit community is currently an issue. Establishing government wide rules of engagement would benefit both the institutions and agencies. Subsequent demonstrations and pilots would prove the initiative to be worthwhile. Currently, A-133 is not utilized as the single audit process it was designed to be. Agencies are commissioning their own audits, often ignoring the A-133 reports. Audits themselves are not conducted with consistent methodology. Each agency approaches the audit scope independently and interprets A-21 and A-110 adherence differently. Electronic research administration will only add another layer of inconsistency to the process. We need to prevent that from occurring by being proactive and address the situation concurrently with the development of agency systems. We need to have an active voice in the process as the audit approach to eRA systems is developed and defined.
A.2	Duke University	As noted above, one of Duke's key objectives for a future upgrade to SPS is integration with FastLane. Such a capability would eliminate the current duplication of effort, as proposal data must now be entered both in FastLane and in SPS. As well, it would extend the features of SPS (e.g., fringe benefit, indirect cost, and inflation calculations) to NSF applications. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it would constitute a major step toward the future of electronic research administration, in which institutional and sponsor-based systems work together as a seamless network, facilitating the proposal submission and award administration processes. Duke plans to achieve this objective using EDI Transaction Set 194,

		which has emerged from the FDP as the standard for electronic data interchange. Duke's development team will write the code necessary to convert files from SPS into this format, from which they can be uploaded directly into FastLane. This uploading will be done only by authorized research administrators in either the Office of Research Support or the Medical Center Office of Grants and Contracts, and will occur only after all routing, corrections, and approvals have been arranged via SPS. To assess the impact, Duke will look at a variety of measures. A key indicator will be the reduction in duplicate data entry, which can be simply measured by determining the amount of NSF proposal activity through the EDI Transaction Set 194 interface, which otherwise would have required separate entry in SPS and FastLane. As well, Duke will consider developing a survey instrument to measure such indicators as user acceptance and ease of transition to the new system.
A.2	University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio	Admittedly, this initiative, as required by PL106-107, is well underway among the various government agencies and the FDP has already partnered with the e-Grants initiative of the government. Because colleges and universities receive a majority of the awards (in numbers, not dollars) we believe that special attention should be given with the e-Grants initiative in making any electronic proposal and technical report submission as transparent as possible for the faculty investigators. We believe that it would be useful for the FPD IV to pilot a project where our faculty representatives would work directly with the various e-Grants committees in those areas where they (the faculty) would be impacted including, but not limited to, biographical sketches, work statements, and other support. We believe that the faculty could assist government representatives in suggesting methods and approaches to these topic areas. The impact would be an acceptable method of compiling faculty investigator-generated information and work statements on proposals. The expected benefits would be the development of a clear, concise format for faculty investigators to use in submitting proposals electronically.
A.2	Washington University	The NSF's Fastlane system has been implemented with broad and positive support from the University's faculty and staff, but approximately 85% of the proposal documents submitted to other sponsoring agencies are on paper. The University strongly supports efforts to develop proposal submission systems at other Federal agencies. A standard federal electronic proposal submission system would substantially reduce the administrative effort for all parties involved and increase the efficiency of the entire process.
A.3	California Institute of Technology	One of the continuing themes of the FDP is electronic research administration and the quest for a unified approach to ERA throughout the federal research community - sponsors and recipients. There is a strong possibility that FDP IV may see the achievement of one of the fundamental goals of the ERA movement: a common mechanism for submitting research proposals. Caltech proposes to work closely with the FDP and Federal Commons groups to assist in developing and demonstrating mechanisms for proposal submission. The promise of the Federal Commons for a single point of entry for proposal submission is one that we strongly endorse and will work to bring about.
A.3	Case Western Reserve University	Expansion of eRA to the grant review process would ease current constraints of proposal review and resubmission of grants. Often, there is too little time between notification of grant status and the next submission date to adequately revise a research plan. An FDP demonstration could address the impact of the electronic review process on timely resubmission of grants by faculty researchers.

A.4	Colorado State	'Best Practices' model for IT security in light of September 11, 2001. a.) Information linked to web sites containing building plans, location of bio-hazards and other material capable of use as a weapon b.) Wireless devices broadcasting sensitive data and passwords without encryption c.) Implementation of digital signatures to assure identification, authentication of documents and software updates using common production applications: • -Personal Certificates (X.509) • -Authentication to web server • -Microsoft Authenticode • -Microsoft Office 2000 / VBA Macro Signing • -Apple Code Signing • -Netscapte Object Signing • -Marimba Channel Signing d.) Site visits by HHS auditors to review IT security
A.5	Cornell University	Second, effects of OMB regulations on faculty productivity have been discussed repeatedly throughout Phase III. The faculty feels that this issue is at the heart of FDP's mission and that it should be a primary focus of Phase IV. The faculty is especially interested in documenting among their peers the costs of OMB regulations in the broad context of regulatory compliance costs. Unfunded compliance mandates not only effect research administrators, but also impact faculty productivity.
A.5	Dartmouth College	Electronic business processes should be an important part of FDP Phase IV. Hopefully during Phase IV, the Institutional Profile and the Professional Profile that were developed at the beginning of Phase III can be tested in the electronic environment. In addition, Dartmouth would like to propose the further testing of various data transfer mechanism (EDI, XML) by adding additional institutions to give them the opportunity to test their data transfer vehicle with the federal agencies. Other areas that Dartmouth views as important would be the continued effort with the PL106/107 working groups. As more progress is made on the Federal side, the FDP should continue to be ready to respond to new developments in streamlining business processes.
A.5	University of Wisconsin – Madison	NSF now requires electronic submission of progress reports through FastLane. As a result, calls from the agency complaining about late reports that were actually sent in to the agency have ceased. If the other federal agencies had the same type of requirement and the same database capabilities to handle them, lost reports would become a thing of the past. The timesavings for the university community, particularly PIs, would be of great benefit.
A.5	Washington State University	We also believe that the proposal and award processing function of Washington State University could be streamlined to eliminate redundant date capture and storage from the proposal stage through the award acceptance, thus enhancing communication and processing through the submitting department, the pre-award office, and post-award levels. This existing redundancy causes many inconsistencies, errors, and inefficiencies. Business process logic and business rules will be developed and deployed to enhance information integrity. A possible solution is for development and deployment of a web-based database. This database will be ubiquitously available throughout the greater WSU community and will include business logic and rules for establishing information integrity. This will improve efficiency and accuracy while reducing

		duplication of information. This process could also lead to the framework to develop a sophisticated electronic billing and reporting process.
A.2,A.3 A.5	*Emory*	Emory University would encourage the Federal Demonstration Partnership to concentrate its efforts on the meaningful implementation of the Federal Commons. While electronic research administration was a focus of FDP III, concrete systems have not emerged. The cost of ERA for universities stands to become prohibitive if a standard system is not implemented by the Federal agencies. Two specific demonstration projects that FDP IV should address are: the elimination of institutionally signed annual continuation proposals (to be replaced with electronic progress reports) and a requirement that Federal agencies have a process in place that ensures that electronic competing proposal submissions are transmitted by an institutional office. For Emory, the benefits of eliminating the institutional signature requirement on continuation proposals would be immediate. The faculty would give two enthusiastic thumbs up to not having to "route" a progress report and the burden to the administrative research offices would be greatly reduced. Requiring electronic competing proposals to be submitted from the institutional office would ensure that applications submitted conform to agency guidelines and ensure that the Institution has reviewed and approved the application. We would also encourage all agencies to issue awards electronically. The reason is two-fold, first the awards are received more quickly and secondly, they get to the "right" office for processing. Receipt of NSF and NIH awards electronically has allowed the faculty at Emory to begin their research on schedule.
A.2.e	Florida International	Since FDP is meant to streamline business with the federal government, it should serve as a voice for expanding e-business. NSF and NIH already send most of their awards electronically, but when can we expect the same level of efficiency from other federal agencies?
A.2.d	Florida Atlantic University	More agencies using electronic submission. This must be standardized and not individualized to the individual agencies' whims. 2. No-Cost Extensions by regular e-mail or by web e -mail. This would be of great assistance to Principal Investigators and administrators alike.
A.3,A.2	*Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center*	Implementation by FDP institutions of a system for electronic proposal submission using the Federal Commons. While Phase III was identified as having a primary focus of electronic research administration systems, in truth, the timing was too early. During the six years of the Phase IV, however, it will be possible to begin the long-awaited submission of proposals electronically to agencies other than NSF. While the burden of such a trial on research institutions could be substantial, it would be well worth undertaking by FDP because of the benefits. Proposal submission will be electronic, and FDP institutions would have a considerable opportunity to influence the process through participation in a submission demonstration. On a smaller scale, we suggest the possibility of a demonstration with NIH. eSNAP, which has been closed for testing in the last year, is likely to be moving again, and FDP institutions could provide an active and constructive test-bed for a trial to submit SNAP proposals electronically. If testing with eSNAP is too far along for FDP to join, then we propose a demonstration to submit Just-in-Time (JIT) materials electronically. Currently, NIH allows JIT submission of IRB approvals, certification of human subjects education, and Other Support, all of which require an institutional endorsement. While these materials are generally faxed, it would be a definite improvement to submit them electronically, even by email. Clearly, NIH would have questions to raise about signatures, as the materials require the signature of an authorized institutional official. Still, it seems likely that discussions

		between NIH and research institutions could lead to some agreement to take this small, electronic step.
A.1,A.3	*Kent State University*	It would help if NIH and DOEd would adopt NSF FastLane-like systems and if DOEd were to participate in the FDP. FastLane has reduced copying/mailing expenses (SP's annual FedEx bill totals $9,000). The impact of other agencies following suit could be measured through labor/duplicating costs and the check amount issued to Fed Ex .If, like NSF, other agencies were to effect an electronic award process, administrators could view current grants, verifying by project end date that No Cost Extensions were in the system. With NIH/DOEd, an NCE request is emailed to the grant specialist. If the specialist has departed, the message remains in cyberspace; acknowledgement of NCE approval is not timely. Tracking time would be reduced if the entry were viewable electronically. Ideally, the Federal Commons will be realized as the universal federal agency electronic application/award system. Where proposals necessitate high-resolution graphics for accurate interpretation, NSF requires paper copies containing color. Burden (labor/mailing) would be reduced if reviewers were required to use online submissions with color enabling correct review. If other agencies enable electronic submission, they, too, should require online review for access to high-resolution graphics .
A.2	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	A major challenge facing both the government and the higher education community is that of making the application, award, and postaward management of research projects standard among agencies...and standard does not mean "the most restrictive in every case." Standard means the joint development of one or more standardized systems. An institution could select one of the standardized systems to utilize for its application process, for example. The current situation of agencies (and even programs with agencies) developing unique, one-off application procedures is expensive, time consuming, non-value added, and daunting to the institutions who must develop expertise (both at the the researcher and the institution administrative levels) to deal with the diversity. PL 106-107 can help, but only if there is real commitment to a common, shared vision, and both agencies and institutions are able to select one of a few (maximum 3-4) systems for the development and submission of all proposals. This presupposes commitment from all parties first, the identification and development of the few systems of record, limited numbers of agencies and schools to test the developing systems, and government wide implementation. The benefits are significant, the most important being that schools and agencies currently on the sidelines will more easily move forward more proactively the eRA.
A.2c	North Carolina State University	Technical reporting at a comprehensive institution can be very difficult to monitor.Central research administrative offices tend to get involved in technical reporting once such reports are late and sponsors are threatening non-payment or other recourse. Our clientele are not interested in the fact that often they've submitted their technical reports on time but for some reason the appropriate officers of the sponsor have not been alerted. We are in the early stages of discovery surrounding the opportunity to implement a central repository using our GAMS system for technical (as well as financial, equipment and technology reporting). This will provide one common, digital portal for our clientele to submit their reports and for our sponsors to view them. The demonstration will be to solicit federal (and state)agencies to release their current reporting requirements, standardize a reporting mechanism and manage such reporting through a standardized web-based portal. This will greatly reduce the burden on scholars as they will no longer be

		faced with multiple reporting requirements; administrators will be more engaged in understanding and monitoring the reporting process; and agencies will be comforted by a stand-alone system used by all recipient for all types of reporting.
A.2	Northwestern	It must continue to push for common standards for era systems and a common portal for grant administration with all grant- making agencies.
A	Penn State	continue to give leadership on eRA initiatives
A.3,	San Diego State University Foundation	We suggest a demonstration where federal agencies utilize one central database where institutions post and update certifications annually. We suggest a demonstration where federal agencies post electronically (on the world wide web, forexample), the proposal's status in the review process. We would like to test the feasibility of having a system whereby both the applicant institution and the sponsoring agency are notified that proper internal approvals of proposals have been obtained prior to the agency commencing peer review of proposals transmitted electronically by a PI
A.3	University of Houston	A Demonstration to Implement PI Profiles (Given the existence of NIH Commons in its current form. If not, possibly deferring to the equivalent NSF, NIH, ONR, NOAA, USDA outcome)
A.5	University of Michigan	Publicize and disseminate applicants existing and planned efforts existing to reengineer and improve the effectiveness of processes and systems for administration of federal research support.
A.2	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	The need for the federal organizations and universities to standardize and simplify the electronic proposal submission process for non-profit research projects.
A.2,A.3	University of North Carolina, Wilmington	FDP should continue to pursue is consistency across agencies for reporting and forms. If FDP again aligns its support for this initiative (and the Federal Commons by reference) and more agencies become involved, a new energy may be found.
A.3	University of North Florida	Pilot testing of the current FDP initiative of the Integrated Performance Standards Task Force of creating a uniform format for communicating funding announcements and regulations and evaluating its impact on timeliness of announcement notifications, ease of communicating notices to faculty, and reduction of incompliance in responses to requests for applications. UNF would welcome the opportunity to participate in a demonstration project in support of possible Public Law 106-07 Task Force initiatives related to the development of a common portal for electronic submission of proposals through the Federal Commons. It is especially important to UNF, as an institution with relatively fewer resources devoted to research administration than research institutions, to determine whether electronic proposal submission will decrease the administrative burden of copying and distributing paper proposals by providing a system with an ease of use that will encourage faculty to utilize the system or if its complexity will require the intervention of sponsored programs staff creating a larger burden than the current system.
A.3, A.3a,A.2	University of North Texas	The task of consolidation can be better accomplished in three distinct stages. The first stage would undertake the repairing the existing systems. The second stage would be to group the application in to cadres of two to eight agency applications. The clustering would attempt to place applications with other applications very closely related in content requested as well as methods of transmission and receipt. The cadres would develop a single application meeting the needs of the entire cadre as well as utilizing a consistent document format. This process would continue the classification by grouping the cadres into larger groups finally resolving into a single application for the main types of transmission and receipt. The final stage would be the decision on the preferred

		method of transmission and the combining of the content requests from other methods to result in a single application for all federal programs. The creation and/or expansion of a central information bank to which inquiries can be directed. Granted that if the direct line is known, one prefers to directly dial that line; however, locating an unknown contact often takes multiple calls to many offices. Ideally, the solution is an exhaustively expansive on-line directory maintained by a librarian within each agency and linked to a larger single directory. User friendly forms from the Department of Defense using standardized language such as that used by other federal agencies
A.3	University of Pennsylvania	The NIH and other major funding agencies could move ERA a giant step forward by partnering with the National Science Foundation FastLane or appropriate modifications thereto or utilizing EDI. The "not-invented-here" syndrome prevalent in sponsoring agencies has stymied progress in this important area. Much of the proposal submission and grants administration technology exists at NSF. a. Assessing Impact: The Federal agencies must develop grant submission technologies that can readily and easily be adapted by the largest number of institutions without major infrastructure investments. Inexpensive web technologies (browsers) already exist that would facilitate proposal submission by the smallest of applicants. With modifications of FastLane screens utilizing current NIH resources, a demonstration project could be established that could test the feasibility of RFA proposal submission to the NIH. An alternative sample set would be to use non-competing continuation applications submitted through a FastLane-like process. b. Expected Benefits: The benefits of electronic submission are obvious: rapid transmission of proposals; reduction of paperwork burdens; faculty are already familiar with FastLane and the process has been shown to work**.**
A.3	University of South Florida	FDP committee to continue its advocacy for the Federal Commons: The lack of a common federal system for electronic research administration (ERA) is fostering the proliferation of agency-specific ERA systems that lack a common interface. This creates redundancy at all levels and inhibits the ability of universities to send proposals electronically from our proposal development systems using data streams such as EDI and XML. Lack of a common federal system or interface creates burdens for investigators and research administrators and system inefficiencies as data must be entered twice in the agency's and the university's systems. It also creates frustration for the research faculty and staff as each system must be mastered as it is rolled out. One of the most important benefits of a common federal interface would be the electronic submission of proposals to all federal agencies via the institution's proposal development system. This ability would encourage universities to develop or acquire the technology that best serves their needs for an integrated solution to proposal development and grants management. **Method**: **This is a plea** to emphasize how important it remains for FDP to advocate for the completion of the Federal Commons**.**
A.2d,A.2	University of Texas, Austin	Further implementation of simplified electronic awards – Currently there are three Federal agencies transmitting electronic awards to the University on a regular basis (NSF, NIH, and ONR). It would be beneficial for all of the agencies to develop a similar, simplified notice of award process. These awards do not require signatures and are either sent via email or accessed through a web site. The nature of the awards expedites the review and ultimate establishment of research account numbers. The time required to set up the accounts is minimal since the documents do not require preparation of a transmittal letter or signatures. The fact that the awards are not sent surface mail impacts the timeframe considerably. In addition to saving time, there would also be a significant reduction in paperwork. Web access to the applicable terms and conditions would allow for further reductions in paperwork as well as processing time. Simplification of common data standards and implementation of electronic proposals and awards – The creation of the EDI transaction sets for proposals and awards has not resulted in widespread electronic research processes. Re-visiting this issue is required. A simplified set of common standards needs to be developed. These standards need to be available in various simplified formats. The formats need to focus on use of institutions' systems rather than on sponsors' systems. Uploading data from the institutions' systems should be the

		highest priority. This would encourage greater participation. The obvious benefits include reduction of paperwork, time savings, reduction of data entry points and ultimately, quicker access to funding for the research projects.
A	University of Texas, Dallas	UT Dallas would also like to see the emergence of even more electronic research administration (ERA). This will "streamline" and lighten the burden place on research administration.
A.3	University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston	Consistency in reporting requirements and rules interpretation across all Federal agencies. It would be very beneficial to complete the Federal Commons website and require all Federal agencies to use it. It is our hope that the Federal Commons will be the clearinghouse for all reporting requirements across all federal agencies. This again, would enable investigators and sponsored projects staff to more efficiently and effectively meet federal standards, and thus have more time and energy to devote to other research issues.
A.3	Medical University of South Carolina	The importance of this initiative is reflected by the FDP in its establishment of a standing committee on Electronic Research Administration. The Partnership's formulation of ten core principles for electronic commerce in grants administration provides a sound basis for any Federal Agency developing an electronic system. As an advocate of the research community, institutional members should be willing to participate in pilot projects for e-commerce developed by their federal partners. Participating in testing and evaluation of any system developed as a result of the current SBIR solicitation by NIH (RFA-RR-02-004) to develop products and services supporting ERA would provide valuable input for the agency. The range of FDP membership provides an excellent resource for this purpose. Institutions of different sizes and levels of information technology resources could be chosen to assess the overall suitability of the system. Institutions could be selected for alpha and beta testing of products. This type of collaboration would create a product that was useful to both the applicant and the sponsoring agencies.
A.	New Mexico State University	Continue discussion and sharing of ideas in the area of ERA.
A.2,A.3		**Standardizing E-Grant Forms** Problem: Faculty and research administration offices are confronted with a plethora of paper and electronic forms. Meeting the diverse requirements on application forms of different federal agencies is burdensome to productive researchers. Suggested Approaches: 1. Using committees and task forces, FDP has successfully addressed several high priority issues, such as developing a standardized subaward agreement. This model could be an ideal approach to work with the federal sponsors and partners in developing more uniform application forms. 2. Building on FDP's experience with piloting the NSF E-Signature, EGrant Forms would be piloted among institutional and faculty constituents, as well as the federal sponsors and partners. Expected Benefits: 1. Standardized E-Grant forms will eliminate one of the most burdensome components of the federal application process and increase the PI's allocation of time to research. 2. Research administrators will have more time to focus on substantive application issues. 3. Positive experience in this area should facilitate adoption of additional forms streamlining initiatives by federal sponsors. For example federal requests for certifications and assurances need to be standardized. FDP has completed a project on standardized Institutional Profiles.

		These profiles, together with standard E-forms should facilitate adoption of a central location among federal sponsors for the storage of e-grant information.
A.5.a	Southwest Texas State	Many of these projects show how pre- and post-award offices can work cooperatively to provide virtually seamless service to faculty and staff submitting proposals and administering grants, even when the offices report to two different Vice Presidents. 1. Proposal Budget Workbook 2. Proposal/Contract Data Sheet 3. Electronic routing of proposals for approval 4. Interactive web site 5. Electronic transfer of award information 6. Electronic submission of internal grant program (REP) 7. Electronic submission of IRB protocols 8. Sponsored Programs Advisory Council 9. Undergraduate Research Council 10. Development of a Web Based Effort Reporting System 11. Developing electronic processes for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) a. Methods/approaches: Study sample processes from other universities; design a method that will work on our own system; incorporate what we learned from developing the electronic IRB processes; test the process before presenting it to faculty. b. Assessing impact: Solicit responses from users (anecdotal and quantifiable). c. Expected benefits: Having the process on line assures that outdated forms will not be used, that forms can be easily updated, that the process will become faster and more efficient for both faculty and reviewers.
A.5a	University of Missouri--Columbia	Integration of and conversion to sponsored programs electronic administrative systems with enterprisewide electronic administrative systems. Methods: Sharing of experiences is a key factor in reducing time, effort and errors associated with such transitions. Effectiveness of the sharing process has a number of limitations. Among these are comparability of circumstances (volume, functional responsibility distribution, variations in administrative software system adopted, etc.) and opportunities for sharing information. Assessment: Whether or not other institutions can benefit from the experiences of the University of Missouri and do not need to “reinvent the wheel.” Benefits: Reduced time, cost and frustration of major sponsored program software implementations; greater ease of proposal preparation and processing; more effective use of resources; more efficient sponsored project management; and more effective coordination of regulatory requirements for compliance and reporting.
A.2d	University of North Texas Health Science Center	Develop IT research administration standards that could be adapted by minimally computer literate offices with small budgets, but that would meet most agency requirements. Set time lines for implementation, milestones for assessment and evaluation schedules that participants would agree to complete. Address electronic signatures in a manner with which most institutions could comply. Most people know that there is a problem with meeting this requirement, but they have limited knowledge regarding the limiting factors to implementation. Spell out costs, personnel knowledge requirements, and possible problems known at this time. Develop guidelines and advise small institutions with minimal IT budgets regarding implementation of ERI . Larger institutions are well on the way to accomplishing institution wide implementation. That information could be shared, as well as the anecdotal information on the pitfalls and quagmires to be avoided. Continue the standardization process begun by NIH and NSF . These agencies have absolutely had the interests of the research

		community central to their ERI activities.
A.3	University of Oklahoma	The University of Oklahoma is interested in exploring ways of integrating the EDI transaction set into our current systems and is willing to serve on demonstrations that will cut down on manual transactions, be they in university or sponsor systems.
A.3, A.2	University of Minnesota	We will continue to develop our eRA capabilities but would like to integrate our efforts with those of the FDP, particularly in the areas of standardization at the federal level (public law 106-107, Federal Commons), both technically and in their business processes. This will have immense benefits for universities by providing uniformity, and will save both resources and time that could easily be squandered if the agencies are all doing eRA differently. Specifically, we would like to be involved in implementing EDI and HTML/XML streaming for data transfer.
A.3	University of Rochester	**Burdens Associated with "Rogue" or Agency-Specific ERA Systems**: There has been ongoing dialogue with respect to the burdens imposed by numerous agency-specific electronic proposal systems. As we move forward with implementation of PL 106-107, hopefully, the appearance of systems not directed toward a common federal solution will dissipate. In the interim, we would suggest that a pilot be initiated that would require that individual agencies at least "clear" their independent agency-specific ERA systems through a common point of review. Through this review, a "clearinghouse" could ascertain whether there are elements of the agency's system or process that are outside commonly accepted parameters (e.g., the ability for institutional review, sufficient agency technical capability, etc.). As an example, we spent several hours recently trying to ascertain sufficient information on the DOE IIPS submission. In the least, a central point of review could verify that sufficient information exists for the grantee in order to submit the proposal! Measure of success would be easily verifiable by the clearinghouse, as evidenced by instructions to the agencies for system improvement. Benefits would include (while not the sought after solution) a common denominator for all these independent systems that take up significant faculty and staff time and resources.
A.5	The University of Texas at Arlington	UTA is also interested in participating in any pilot projects for electronic routing of proposals and securing of internal electronic signatures. We are aware of MIT's system and would be interested in working with smaller research universities in ways to pilot similar systems for smaller and less complex institutions.
A.3	UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI	Unification of Agencv Rules,Regulations, Requirements and Forms- The burden imposed on universities to learn and use different proposal forms, different government software systems, different reporting forms in addition to the myriad of rules and regulations from different agencies imposes a heavy cost and burden on the administration of sponsored programs. There should be no higher goal to FDP than too reduce the administrative burden of institutions. This can be best accomplished if the funding agencies utilize their collective best to have systems and procedures that are similar in nature. One solution is for FDP to work with responsible agencies to develop a unified set of regulations and requirements that meet everyone's needs.
A.3.b,A.2d	Texas Engineering Experiment Station	1. A demonstration project in which a common web site is created by the government that would allow access to all active projects that are federally funded. The page could allow users to see, by sponsor, active projects, projects which have reports due, projects that have terminated but have outstanding deliverables, etc. The site could be a link to various sponsor sites to allow communication to and from the sponsor. This could actually be like a web based portal that the institution could use to manage its federal funding. Agencies as well as the institutions could provide feedback as to how it helped improve efficiency, etc. The federal agencies could provide information on if this helped with deliverables, reminders, reporting

		requirements, billing issues etc. 2. A pilot project in which all FDP grants are submitted to the institutions electronically, similar to how NSF and ONR award grants now. Taking this a bit further, a single grant document could be developed that all federal agencies use to award grants electronically. It would be difficult to get the agencies to agree to change their current systems of awarding grants. Perhaps getting two or three to start would be a good approach and then others would participate. The benefits of having a single award type and method of delivery would be great to schools that administer large amounts of grants. Time lost tracking paper and lost would awards would be reduced since the institution can view on-line awards made to them.
A.2,A.3	Texas Tech University	The template for federal funding opportunities, The common data elements for the institutional profile, The common data elements for the professional profile, The collection of institutional certifications on an annual basis to be made available to awarding agencies in a central location. The point of the demonstration would be simply to demonstrate the feasibility of collecting annual certifications and making them available on a website. The first step would be to identify the certifications to be included, then FDP institutions that chose to participate would complete and sign those certifications and send them as separate PDF files to the coordinator of the demonstration who would then post them on the site. The site would be similar to the Office for Human Research Protections site which lists institutions with OHRP-approved assurances; the difference would be that it would be possible to actually access the certifications. Since this information is all public, there would be no need to limit access to the site. The evaluation would address: Whether it was possible to obtain certifications from institutions and keep the certifications current, Whether the alternative process saved time for institutional grants offices, Whether the alternative process saved time for agency grants officers, Whether the process provided the agencies with required certifications. The outcome to be hoped for at the end of the demonstration would that FDP agencies at least would accept this alternative form of certification and that the federal agencies would take over the maintenance of the certification site, possibly adding it to the Federal Commons.
A.2,A.3	The University of Arizona	We are primarily interested in implementation of standardized electronic application, award, and payment processes
A.5b	University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences	ARIA is unique from other software in that it will allow all IRB information to be managed electronically. Investigators will be able to submit their IRB protocols online, primary and secondary reviewers will be able to review and comment online, and meeting events and comments can be added in real-time as the IRB meeting goes on. The benefits of the system have not been quantified, but we believe in due time that the burden of IRB paper management will be significantly reduced and our ability to communicate with federal auditors will be greatly enhanced. This is something we will not be able to test until we get audited again or until we apply for accreditation from NCQA, but at least we will be prepared.
A.5	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	**Electronic Approval and Routing:** One ongoing FDP project of interest to UALR is electronic approval and routing. Electronic signatures (acceptable for the university and for external sponsors) is also of interest. Electronic approval and routing (along with electronic signatures) will result in time savings and accuracy. **Electronic Document Filing and Archiving:** In July 2002, ORSP will purchase scanning equipment. Scanning will be used to archive submitted proposals, attach electronic copies of proposals and other documents to Banner postaward files. This will complement UALR's transition to electronic invoicing and electronic routing as well as providing a reasonable way to work with the increasing number of proposals that are submitted electronically and do not exist in paper. Fully implemented, this will put all active documents within the computer environment and reduce the paper use and storage. As ORSP develops policies and procedures for this transition, it will be important to learn from those who are further along in similar processes.

A.1,A.2	University of California-Systemwide	A. Standardization of federal systems, regulations, and processes. B. Use of readily available desktop technologies in federal ERA implementation. C. Use of text which can be transferred easily across various platforms. D. Creation of a common proposal and award forms and close-out for all federal agencies. E. Use of single set of application formats and award terms. F. Requirement for official institutionally approved submission. G. Consider the costs to grantees in the implementation of federal ERA requirements.
A.2,A.3	University of Chicago	FDP IV's number one priority for improving the partnership between university-federal agencies has to be a rational implementation of federal ERA initiatives. FDP has been and should be even more aggressively a forum for common approaches and wise strategic planning and implementation of ERA systems across the government. FDP IV offers the best opportunity for higher education community and federal agencies to collaboratively achieve systems that streamline processes, assure government and institutional accountability and enhance the productivity of the federal investment in research.
A.2,A.3	University of Florida	There have been extensive efforts by FDP members (institutions and federal partners) to develop transaction sets for electronic data interchange (EDI) and webbased portals for e-grants that will enable sponsors and recipients to communicate using the Federal Commons as well as other electronic systems. The Electronic Commerce Committee (ECC) and the onset of PL 106-107 illustrate the government's recognition of the need for commonality among electronic systems and grant administration regulations and guidelines. While there has been much activity by FDP in demonstrating which electronic systems work and what does not work, there has been little progress in developing common electronic systems at federal agencies, even though it is recognized that common information is needed by sponsoring agencies. In order to facilitate common data and information processing for e-grants, FDP should consider putting out an RFP to information systems vendors to provide support for universities in performing a demonstration project whereby the vendor with selected FDP schools will provide common data to two or more federal agencies (preferably NSF and NIH) for proposal submissions. (Such vendors are called value added networks - VANs.) If this approach were successful, there would be an opportunity for FDP to contribute to the ongoing development of uniform e-grant applications. This would move FDP from the position of reacting to new and different systems to providing an alternative approach to solving the problem of the lack of uniform electronic systems and would be a benefit to the e-grant process for both universities and our federal partners.
A.2.e,A.3	University of Houston	A Demonstration to Implement PI Profiles (Given the existence of NIH Commons in its current form. If not, possibly deferring to the equivalent NSF, NIH, ONR, NOAA, USDA outcome) Burden/Problem Time consuming to provide PI information in various sponsor required formats. Methodology/Approach A faculty sample would be used to collect profile information according to the key data elements identified by the NIH Commons. Ways to Assess the Impact Survey of participants after a period of time (minimum of 6 months) to determine the usefulness of the standardized format. Expected Benefits Reduced time required to track PI information by standardizing the format and data required by sponsors in the initial application process.
A.3, A.3c	University of Illinois, Chicago	A demonstration project on the NIH Commons electronic research administration system is warranted in Phase IV. Currently, this system is in a state of revision. The pilot project, conducted in collaboration with FDP, was successful in identifying areas of weakness and the NIH is now in the process of revising their system to allow for wider distribution. As the NIH funded 76% of UIC's Federally funded projects in FY2001, it is vital for UIC

		to be involved in the next phase of evaluation. With the continued thrust towards electronic research administration, testing of the NIH Commons electronic submission system is an important step to facilitating the process of streamlining research processes and reducing the administrative burdens of investigators. As agencies launch their own electronic media for protocol submission, it is necessary to assess the impact of having multiple protocol submission venues on investigators' and administrators' time and resources. The eRA task force should evaluate the impact of these protocol submission systems on investigators and research administrators. In the future, perhaps a unified approach to the electronic submission of research protocols can be attempted. A system that includes by both generic and agency specific information should evolve into a centralized system (supported by the Federal Commons) for research protocol submission for Federally funded research. This process of evaluation and redirection will benefit the research community by further streamlining the administration of research at the Federal level and enhance e-Government strategies. In Phase IV of the FDP, we suggest that a system to maintain institutional assurances and certifications be developed and pilot tested by the FDP members. This system/database should be web-based and each institution or funding agency would have access to the information. The system would be able to generate e-reports and e-notification upon proposal submission. Institutions would maintain paper reports for auditing purposes but these would no longer be necessary for submission. This system could later be extrapolated to investigator initial and continuing education requirements for human subjects research. The system would further streamline the administrative process for proposal submission for institutions and investigators as well as continue to move towards the mandate of improving e-Government and UI's mandate of a paperless society.
A.2.e	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Some years ago, FDP finalized an institutional profile dataset. To date, this data standard has not been used for its intended purpose. (In the meantime, the Central Contractor Registry was fully implemented.) The FDP institutions could provide their profile information, including institutional certifications, to a central, web-based repository that each funding agency and other institutions could access. This demonstration could serve as a pilot for the Federal Commons in terms of structuring and maintaining the database. It can also facilitate subawarding by providing such information as F&A rates, A-133 audit status, etc.
A.3.d	University of Kansas and the KU Center for Research, Inc. (KUCR)	We expect ERA initiatives to move to the forefront during Phase IV, and would be very supportive of such measures. For our part, we would offer the LEMUR project for open use and co-development with federal and other institutional partners. We feel the integration of Government and University systems is a needed step to eliminate duplicative work. Data should only be keyed once. A standard protocol for transmission of that data should be a primary goal. Our technical staff will be very supportive of these goals, and will work side by side with other FDP member organizations to make this work.
A.2.c,A.2.e	University of Maryland, College Park	Technical Report Submission Technical reporting requirements differ by sponsor and yet have many similarities. These similarities include such items as the frequency and format of the reports. Some federal agencies require special report forms; others only informal reports. The submission of project reports is a high-priority accountability issue, since this is one of the ways federal sponsors measure results. Follow-up on mission reports is a time-consuming administrative burden for principal investigators, university administrative personnel, and federal personnel. A pilot project could be developed for online submission of technical reports. A report filed once, in one place, could be accessed by many. Just as we look to other terms and conditions of awards to be consistent, reporting requirements should be consistent. The development of technical reporting templates and online submission of reports would help achieve this goal. * University Profiles All agencies need representations and certifications from university applicants. In addition, university negotiated facility and administration cost rates and audit information is often requested. If each university were to have a profile available, the administrative burden of providing and reviewing this routine information hundreds of times annually would be reduced for everyone

		involved in the proposal and award process. Agency personnel would have access to university profiles and with one inquiry would know if all was in order. This remains an important need. Faculty Profile Similar to University Profile. As agencies are developing systems, researchers are required to register separately for each system.
A.3,A.1	University of Massachusetts Medical School	The role of the FDP in interfacing with federal agencies will continue to be critical in developing consistent, efficient and effective electronic systems for administration of federally sponsored projects. While inconsistencies exist between agencies in terms of proposal requirements in the current, paper-based processes, minimizing inconsistencies in future initiatives for electronic systems will increase the ability of all participants to leverage the benefits of ERA. All grant applications and awards contain similar institutional and faculty data, regardless of the sponsor. Faculty and research administrators recognize that different agencies do have different requirements in terms of proposal content and funding restrictions. However, the general process is largely the same across all agencies. The "common interface" should be more than just an interface to a variety of disparate systems. During the past several years, there has been great anticipation of ERA systems. However, institutions are unclear about the scope or level of investment for electronic systems that will be required to support an interface with federal agencies. Pilot projects for proposed electronic system via the FDP will be of great value to participating institutions in assessing the viability of the system and planning for the associated institutional investment and redesign efforts.
A	University of Massachusetts at Amherst	By virtue of its participation in the GAMS consortium the pilot efforts we are most equipped to participate in are related to ERA. A recent listing of efforts initiated by the Federal agencies includes: E-link, E-Application, E-Grants, E-GAPS, X-Train, E-2270, AwardWeb, AdminWeb, PayWeb, ReportWeb, ProposalWeb, GMS, NIH Commons, Federal Commons, SYS-EYFUS, and Fastlane. Based on our prior experiences many if not most of these systems have been able to successfully demonstrate an ability to accomplish for their individual agencies some component of the grant life cycle. As we proceed further two important tasks remain. First the evaluation and feedback regarding adherence of these systems to the data standards that have been agreed upon. And two, the continued partnering required to help move the pilot systems to ones that can handle full production. Again PL106-107 will drive the agencies to continue their development efforts, UMass Amherst through FDP participation expects to actively participate in both monitoring and testing of these developing systems.
A.2.e	University of Notre Dame	Overdue reports are a problem for both grantees and the granting agencies. Grantees are affected when a proposal is not processed due to a PI or co-PI not having a report on file for a previous project. Suggested approach: We propose that the FDP work on a project to test the viability and impact of granting agencies sending automated award expiration notices and notifications of reports due. These reports could be done electronically, using an automated system that would require little human intervention, since most agencies already request e-mail addresses from the PIs and administrators. Implementing this system at the granting agency may also help to reduce the possibility of errors in determining due dates of the reports. Ways to assess the impact: The impact of this demonstration would be measured by whether or not reports are submitted in a more timely manner, and whether the amount of effort spent requesting overdue reports decreases for both grantees and granting agencies. Another potential impact could be the improved quality of the reports. It may be possible that if the reports are submitted without pressure of a pending proposal or award being delayed, the report quality could increase. Expected benefits: As mentioned above, the goal is for the agency to receive required reports in a timely manner and in the detail they need. By sending reminders of reports

		due out in advance of the report's due date, reports may be received more promptly. In addition, a notice from the sponsor that a report is due may carry more impact and convey the urgency for submitting the report on time. An additional benefit is that less hands-on time would be sent by the grantee and the granting agency in sending out reminders of overdue reports.
A.2.d	University of Hawaii	Standardization of Federal Sponsor Billing/Reporting Requirements: - Study different agency recommended billing/reporting formats to arrive at an acceptable standard. Need to assess level of usage by participating institutions. - Increases opportunity for computerization and integration with an accounts receivable billing system. It would improve the timeliness of billings received by the Federal agencies as well as improve an institution's cash flow with a faster reimbursement.
A.3,A.5	St. Jude	SJCRH has been involved with the FDP ERA Electronic Approval and Routing system task force for the last several years. Under the leadership of Pamela Webb and Nancy Wilkinson we developed and circulated a survey to identify how organizations were routing their applications for approvals. St. Jude was involved in the initial NIH-COMMONS E-SNAP pilot. We were the first organization to successfully process to completion a Non-Competing Continuation, ESNAP, using NIH-COMMONS. Only one organization submitted more E-SNAPs than St. Jude. This record indicates our dedication to improving technology and making available state -of-the-art processes to the research effort within our organization. We have been approached by several high-tech development companies to partner with them on the " NIH ERA SMALL BUSINESS FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES (ERA-SBIR)" initiative. This effort will fund software companies to develop ERA solutions compatible with the NIH & Federal COMMONS initiatives. SJCRH is currently reviewing vendors to obtain a system that electronically captures and retains all grant/contract information. This new system will maintain all review status of human subjects, vertebrate animals and, bio-safety compliance, as well as, the original application and all progress reports submitted to our sponsors. SJCRH will select two of the original three vendors to return for in-depth specific demonstrations directed to our requirements/needs. Our research administration operation is centralized and is responsible for monitoring all pre-award and post-award grant/contract activities. RA currently employs Info-Ed's Smarts/Genius system to identify funding opportunities for our principal investigators.

Topic	**University**	**Proposed Demonstration**
B	**Faculty Issues**	
B.1 On Line Peer review B.2 Administrative Support on Grants B.3 Faculty eRA Workshops B.4 An assessment of the role and achievements of the faculty FDP initiatives B. 5 Federal Modular Grants B.6 Research & Development Investment ,and Performance Criteria		
B.1	Dartmouth College	Our faculties that serve on review panels have suggested that the NSF model for reviewing proposals be tested by other agencies. The sharing of comments on line while the review is taking place would streamline the review process and reduced the overall time of the review session. Perhaps other agencies would be willing to pilot a review session based on the NSF model with the anticipated outcome more efficient review sessions and reduction of time for the process.
B.2	Dartmouth College	Our faculties are also interested demonstrations that address processes or policy changes that would give them more time to do research and spend less time on research administration. One example would be to demonstrate the cost effectiveness of allowing some administrative support paid directly on grants. With

		the cap on the administrative portion of the F&A rates and the continue increase in compliance costs, institutions have not had the funds to provide administrative support for faculty with federally funded grants. The faculty are therefore spending time reconciling grant expenditures or asking research assistants who do not have the knowledge of the financial regulations to do this work.
B.3	Cornell University	First, faculty representatives are keenly interested in eRA developments at all agencies, but they naturally focus on end-user issues rather than on technical details of eRA implementation. We envision establishing in Phase IV faculty eRA Workshops, perhaps at every FDP meeting, where faculty representatives can meet with eRA experts from FDP and from various agencies. The purpose of the workshops would be to discuss eRA systems under development from the perspective of future users and allow faculty to provide timely advice to developers.
B.5	Florida State University	A possible demonstration for the FDP Phase IV would be modeled after the NIH modular grant program. The demonstration would emulate a version of the NIH modular program, expanding it to include other federal agencies. Such a demonstration would capitalize on efficiencies gained with the promulgation of the expanded authorities and the streamlining gained with the modular grant through the elimination of detailed budgeting currently involved at the proposal and award stages. The expanded authorities were given to institutions as a result of the demonstrations completed during the Florida Demonstration Project (FDP Phase 1). The FDP Phase I demonstration established proof that delegating administrative "prior approvals" to institutions did not jeopardize responsible stewardship of federal funds, and did not adversely impact the research enterprise. Implementation of these changes actually reduced delays in research performance through eliminating time-consuming processes involved with submitting requests to federal agencies and awaiting approval responses. Most FSU faculty identifies budget preparation as the most onerous task in writing proposals. Detailed budget development is a futile process given that faculty will spend an inordinate amount of time developing line item budgets and defending specific proposed costs that may not reflect what is ultimately required to carry out the research project. Research, by its very nature is unpredictable. Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect a researcher to know in minute detail what the cost will be to perform a proposed research project. Recognition of this concept contributed to changes brought about with the expanded authorities that, in part, allowed institutions to approve most rebudgeting actions. The FSU faculty who have submitted NIH Modular Grants have been extremely pleased with the reduction in effort resulting from the elimination of detailed budgets. We believe it is time to go one step further and eliminate the necessity of having to submit extensive costing detail in proposals to other federal agencies. The NIH has taken this step with its modular grant program and it is proposed that this concept be expanded and adopted by other federal agencies. The experience and knowledge garnered by the NIH modular grants program would be of value in the formulation of modular grant guidelines that could be adopted by other federal agencies. This proposed demonstration would promote adoption of a common set of guidelines for modular grants to ensure the greatest benefit through simplicity and consistency of program requirements that institutions would have to follow. A common set of guidelines would facilitate the institutions ability to ensure compliance and prudent management of federal funding by reducing administrative burdens that result when every federal agency's proposal submission process and award administration rules has its own unique requirements. Evaluation of the impact of the demonstration could be assessed by developing a survey instrument that demonstration participants would use to document: • time and effort savings experienced by researchers in proposal preparation, • time and effort savings experienced by researchers and university administrators in the institutional review and approval process, • time and effort savings experienced by peer reviewers and/or federal agency personnel in the proposal evaluation process, • time and effort savings experienced by researchers, institutional administrators and federal agency personnel in the negotiating/awarding process, • determinations by researchers as to whether the reductions result in a recognizable increase in time that is devoted to research, • determinations by federal agency program officers as to whether there is a recognizable increase in research productivity, • analysis of reported time and effort savings experienced in order to assign a

		monetary value. Expected benefits would be substantial savings as a result of reductions in time and effort currently required by all parties involved in the federal grant making process. Through the elimination of administrative processes such reductions should result in increased research productivity and cost savings to both the federal agencies and the institutions.
B.4	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	An assessment of the role and achievements of the faculty FDP initiatives and a determination as to whether the current processes and procedures provide the best vehicle for the significant faculty investment that is needed.
B 4	Northwestern	Faculty and federal agency program staff were formally included for the first time in FDPIII. The primary purpose was to provide a forum for faculty to engage institutional administrators, and administrators and program officers from participating federal agencies in discussions regarding the research policies and practices that affect their laboratory lives on a daily basis. These interactions have generated a dialogue among faculty, research administrators, and federal agency representatives that has focused attention on improving research productivity and efficiency while reducing burdensome oversight. FDP IV will be successful only if it retains this “troicha”. It is essential that all parties work together to increase scientific productivity by relieving the increased burden placed on researchers.
B.6	Medical University of South Carolina	The President's Management Agenda for FY2002 is focused on improving government performance over a range of agencies. One particular initiative is the development of better investment criteria for research and development investment. While the necessity of R&D investment for science and technology is not disputed, the need to measure the effectiveness of these investments to show progress toward strategic goals is important. The initiative recognizes that this progress does not necessarily mean that every project will be successful. Federal Agencies, and Institutional members of the FDP, can establish a task force to solicit input in developing and evaluating performance criteria for applied research and development programs. This group may either be actively involved in the development of these criteria or serve as a review committee to comment and refine the criteria. Input from this task force will serve to reduce or lessen any adverse impact on the existing peer review process that many agencies now use and decrease any anxiety that reviews will be focused on the return of the investment rather than the science involved.
B.4	University of Chicago	FDP IV should have a special evaluation of the role of institutional faculty participation in FDP IV. While faculty representatives provide valuable insight and experience in the discussions at meetings, we believe it is increasingly frustrating for faculty reps to find two days of value meriting attendance at three meetings during the year. FDP III emphasized faculty involvement. Some assessment of how faculty were involved, how many, with what issues and whether the time spent by faculty reps at meetings was well-invested might be considered in an evaluation charge. Without pre-judging an impartial evaluation, we suggest that more effective means for faculty participation, identification of faculty issues and faculty contributions might come as recommendations from such an evaluation. Perhaps a standing committee or an ad hoc committee of faculty reps focused on certain key agency concerns or relationships could be considered.
B.6	University of Illinois, Chicago	One of the Federal Government’s initiatives is to evaluate the effectiveness of its research and development budget expenditures. A collaboration of funding agencies, led by the DOE, has been charged with refining the research and development investment criteria. The results of this collaboration are scheduled for release in the spring of 2002 and will be used to direct research and development budgetary allocations for FY 2004. The FDP is in a unique situation to offer guidance, suggestions and feedback to the collaborating agencies in response to the criteria. As a Phase IV pilot/survey project, the FDP may survey its faculty representatives to evaluate the refined R&D investment criteria in order to assess the pertinent issues of research funding and initiate a dialogue with the Federal Government (through the DOE) on the implications of the evaluation criteria and the resultant changes to federal funding policy. The involvement of the FDP will provide faculty representatives of the FDP (and their sponsor institutions) a forum to generate a concise response and open lines of communication between front- line investigators and Federal Granting Agencies. This process will further the mandate of the FDP to “advocate on behalf of the research community”.
B.6	University of Illinois at Urbana-	The Department of Energy is leading the government-wide effort to refine R&D investment criteria. FDP, because of its faculty representatives, is uniquely

	Champaign	positioned to contribute to this effort by providing suggestions and feedback to DOE.

Topic	University	Proposed Demonstration
C	**Compliance Issues**	
C.1	Costs of Compliance	
C.2	Compliance Issues a. designed & test algorithms to flag potential compliance issues b. create a universal conflicts disclosure form based AAU principles. c. Problems Associated with Just-in-Time (JIT) Review	
C.3	RCR Eudcation Model	
C.4	A joint venture between the government and universities on an accepted COI system.	
C.2	Case Western Reserve University	The impact of terrorist attacks on US and bioterrorism on academic researchers and administrators will likely have a ripple effect. Modifications in training and education in bioterrorism of academics, staff, students and trainees will place a burden on progress in research and costs of research. Access and cost of research training are becoming evident. An FDP task force could focus on the impact of 9/11 on academic researchers with the goal of identifying key areas for reduction of regulatory burden. One example is the impact of new regulations on foreign trainees to submit annually evidence of residency in an academic program. FDP demonstrations could test streamlining, e.g., electronic submission of an annual report, common form, and institutional involvement, to reduce burden on trainee.
C.2	University of Texas, Medical Branch	*Problem/burden to be studied:* Human subject and animal use protocols represent a particular stress point in research compliance. Multiple functions need to be able to secure data regarding the submission, review, status, and approval of these protocols; analyze trends that predict and anticipate the allocation of resources; provide information to institutional executive functions; verify the status of required training and education of key personnel; and respond to requests for information related to compliance and regulation. *Suggested methods/approaches:* Develop a database component that uses the protocol number as the common denominator so that the IACUC or IRB can perform a search and pull data from any source in the database (IACUC, IRB, OSP, and OCR) that "touches" the protocols. Using a cafeteria-style format as to the specific information that can be extracted, reports can be constructed according to user defined parameters. As an example, the IRB can generate a list of all active, NIH-funded protocols by PI, department or any other variable by extracting data from the IRB and OSP databases. This is accomplished by using the protocol numbers as a shared field in the different, but related, systems so that the database can make the association. Data from each system resides on the same database server so there are not any problems created because of incompatible systems or network authorizations. The data for all of these systems reside in Open DataBase Connectivity (ODBC) systems. ODBC is an industry standard that allows information to be exchanged between database systems from different vendors. *Ways to assess impact:* Impact can be assessed by tracking the number and the source of accesses to the IACUC/IRB database. A system constructed in this manner should lead to more efficient tracking of research proposals and the ability to extract and relate a multitude of data for research oversight purposes and outcomes analyses. *Expected benefits:* The functional capability offered by this database provides a more efficient and coordinated process for all aspects of research administration. First, the efficient and rapid generation of lists of protocols by funding source is critical to overall research infrastructure planning and support. The information can be used for both short and long-term planning and management of research resources, such as laboratory animal housing space and equipment needs as well as internal staffing priorities. Departmental administrators are better able to consolidate and update their lists regarding faculty research funding and can use the information to assist in assignment of laboratory space and staffing. Second, assuring compliance in aspects of research administration can also be assisted. OFRC has full access to all databases and can generate protocol lists as needed to assure proper documentation and administration of grants and contracts. Third, when fully developed and operational the database will serve as a repository of information to ascertain if key personnel have the required sponsor and institutional training

		in research involving the use of human subjects or animals. PIs lacking the appropriate training can be "flagged" and notified of their training requirements. All of these lists can also be created as database tables or Excel spreadsheets to allow for further manipulation of the data and ease of distribution. Overall, the administration of research grants and contracts will be better managed and potential compliance issues will be identified more easily.
C.2	Wayne State University	One potential Phase IV demonstration and pilot project that Wayne State University would like to participate in is a process improvement activity that correlates the grant application submitted to the granting agency with the "Research Protocol Summary Form" that is submitted to the various regulatory committees (Institutional Review Board, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, the Biosafety Committee, etc). Recently, the description of the human participant and/or the vertebrate animal portions of the grant applications have become more general in nature because the number of pages used to describe the research plan has stayed the same or in some instances reduced. The regulations concerning the IRB and the IACUC reviewing the grant applications has remained the same and requires both committees to review the research plan in detail. However, less and less detail is provided in the research plan and IRBs, IACUCs, and Biosafety Committees have been required to develop extensive "Research Protocol Summary Forms" that provide information about human and vertebrate animal use in much more detail. Current regulations do not recognize the extensive amount of information that is in these forms that generally overlay (and expand) the description of the research plan. Coordinating between these two documents has become more difficult and institutions (and their sponsors) are at risk when there is disagreement. We would propose an alternative to those applications that includes the proposed use of humans, vertebrate animals, and rDNA. Ways of including access to the "Research Protocol Summary Forms" that address human participants and vertebrate animals in more detail should be explored. While there is a need to have questions that relate to the uniqueness of a particular institution, there is also a need to have the sponsoring agencies review these forms in more detail so that there is agreement between these two documents. If we are successful in improving this linkage, it would benefit the sponsor, the sponsor program office, and the various regulatory committees.
C. 3	*Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center*	One other suggestion comes from the pressures of compliance and compliance education. Institutions managed to meet the OHRP requirement for training programs and certification of training on the use of human subjects with very little assistance and very little time. The policy for Responsible Conduct of Research was withdrawn but nonetheless looms large for us all. FDP is in the marvelous position of having all the players needed to establish some basic standards for RCR education and to elicit general agreement on those standards from Federal agencies and research institutions. A great deal of work at individual institutions has been done on RCR, and NCURA has collected a representative sampling of their materials. FDP could perform an important service by utilizing members to generate RCR guidelines and a prototype training program. While this may not be the traditional approach to a "demonstration," it does meet a pressing need of our members.
C.2	*Georgetown*	To become more efficient, many large institutions have decentralized their compliance functions. When this occurs, central post-award departments can become less effective at overseeing compliance, since departments maintain source documents. The FDP could work to develop software designed with algorithms to flag potential compliance issues, just as many private firms have developed anti-fraud software to review and flag potential irregularities. (An example is ACL, which has a fraud package for its internal audit software).This would offer institutions greater control over compliance without significantly affecting efficiency. It would also allow a centralized post-award department to oversee compliance on an impartial audit basis.
C.1	Johns Hopkins	New regulations (e.g. HIPAA), "voluntary accreditation by AAHRPP, compliance with existing regulations all cost money, most of which is not recoverable through F&A or by direct charge to federal grants. Based on discussions at various professional meetings it is clear that there is no consistent plan among universities for meeting these obligations. We suggest the FDP conduct a survey of as many universities as will agree to participate (mandatory for FDP institutions) to ascertain the plans that are under development or already

		implemented to cope with the rising costs of compliance. The survey should be detailed but not onerous to insure participation. Questions should cover plans for hiring a compliance officer (or, if not, why not), costs of existing in-house training programs and plans for expansion, contingency plans for future regulatory changes, etc.Survey results could be used to make a case for allowing direct charging of some or all of these expenses to all federal grants and to convince the NIH to repeat the current (one-time) grant for compliance costs.
C.1,C.2	Massachusetts General Hospital	Our institutional objectives are to expand the access to and the success of our unique research program, to maintain a supportive environment which is attractive to the most talented and productive scientists, to compete effectively for external funding, and to maintain the highest possible level of compliance with federal regulatory guidelines and with the public's expectation for the responsible conduct of research. In addition, we seek to enhance the value that our research excellence can offer to our clinical efforts as an academic healthcare center. Although the importance and excellence of this program has been continually re-affirmed, we face the reality of competing with the non-academic healthcare providers that bear none of the burden of subsidizing the unrecovered costs of research and training. Priorities for Phase IV demonstration and pilot projects may include: 1The increasing cost of compliance. Unfunded mandates have been a significant cost burden. There is also increased focus on compliance, and documentation of compliance, with the rules and regulations that address human subjects protections. Some requirements generated by OHRP, NIH and FDA are research specific initiatives. But there are others, such as HIPPA, which despite addressing broad, non-research issues have direct as well as indirect effects on the conduct of research. The end result is that research management must be certain that members of its constituency are aware of these requirements, have completed appropriate training/ education, and are in compliance. These requirements for the safe conduct of research require real-time tracking and reporting to funding entitles.
C.1	Northwestern	Northwestern also believes there may be a role for the FDP to play in areas such as the responsible conduct of research and the cost of compliance.
C.1.C.2	University of Nebraska	The concern about the many compliance issues (IP, technology transfer, IRB, IACUC, conflict of interest) and how to share this information with campus administration and faculty researchers is also of great concern to UNO and UNK. UNMC would bring to FDP a keen interest and expertise to these and other compliance issues, such as cost of compliance.
C.4	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	We believe the FDP may be a vehicle to use systems already in production and standardize the application to fit a general model that could be used by many schools. Basically, a joint venture between the government and universities on an accepted system. If used by an institution, certification could be granted for a “green light” (in current government report-card terms) in COI reporting and disclosure.
C.1	University of South Florida	· **Problem:** Cost of Compliance Demonstration Project - The purpose would be to review the increasing burden of research compliance on institutions and to review ways to balance the countervailing trends of increased federal regulations at a time when sponsoring agencies are streamlining their systems to maximize the use of federal dollars. Currently, the cost of compliance is skyrocketing with little relief in the way of standardized processes, rules, regulations, training, etc. **Methods:** One method is to assess which compliance areas are the most time consuming and costly by determining the types of resources needed to comply and conducting a cost assessment. Once the assessment is complete, the participants would explore ideas for standardizing forms and methods for streamlining processes to stabilize or defray costs. One minor method for containing the cost of compliance is for FDP to assemble some standard practices or processes that institutions use for conflict of interest, misconduct in research, monitoring cost accounting standards, cost sharing, etc. from other institutions. From an analysis of the data collected, the most cost-effective and efficient methodologies would be determined and results shared with other FDP members. **Assessing the Impact: The participants would identify rules and regulations that are the most costly and** labor intensive. FDP would quantify, through a survey or other reporting mechanism, the cost or impact of a particular compliance requirement. They would also capture the methods that are currently used to cover these costs, compile the data, and interpret the findings. **Benefits:** This information can be used in a number of ways, such as empirical

		support for appeals to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for elimination or increase of the administrative cap on Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Costs. The data could also serve a useful purpose as a tool for institutions to employ in developing budgets and strategic plans for their research programs.
C.2	Georgia Institute of Technology	We have much to share with the Federal Demonstration Partnership about IRBWISE, an online protocol submission and management system for human subjects research —its development, its successful launch, the focus group experience, and more. We believe the technology is generalizable to other applications, such as the tracking of animal research protocols and research involving recombinant DNA or select agents. We offer to assess its continuing impact and to share what we are learning.
C.2,C.2b	Indiana University	An FDP committee consisting of representatives from Federal agencies and research institutions could result in educational modules related to RCR t to be shared with all the FDP organizations, and beyond. ***Method/Approach*** Based on our experience at Indiana University, the following steps will lead to successful decision making and program implementation: 1. Determine national RCR education goals and invento ry existing resources and programs 2. Determine responsible groups for planning the development and oversight of the RCR program 3. Determine audience or clientele and what content they need 4. Decide upon which media will be used to deliver specific programs 5. Determine methods for assessment, documentation, and tracking of participants 6. Determine how and when the program is to be promoted and implemented 7. Provide for usability testing and make appropriate revisions *Assessment of Impact* Four primary groups should be assessed: 1) audience/clientele, 2) research administration offices administering or tracking data for their faculty/staff/ students, 3) federal agencies requiring or recommending RCR education, and 4) the FDP group responsible for planning and implementation. Mechanisms for assessment will be dependent upon the goals FDP establishes for its RCR program, but would likely include online surveys, user focus groups, and monitoring of users' questions and concerns. ***Expected Benefit*** Because RCR places a burden on all institutions conducting research, development of planning and programming through the FDP could provide standardization, common resources, quality assurance, and cost savings to all participating institutions. This will enable agencies and institutions to more easily do the "right thing." FDP team to create a universal conflicts disclosure form based on AAU recommended principles. ***Method/Approach*** 1. Establish an FDP group to analyze the content of the AAU report for adaptability to a universal Conflict of Interest form 2. Draft, test, analyze, and revise a universal form, either in paper copy or through an ERA solution 3. Issue an FDP-endorsed Conflict of Interest form in paper and/or electronic form 4. Develop a complete ERA process available to FDP institutions to a) make the form available, b) route the form, c) develop a database of institutional information, and d) transfer information among institutions as faculty move ***Assessment of Impact*** There are natural assessment points in this project:

		• After review of the AAU report—can the recommendations be adapted universally? • Ongoing evaluation of the draft and testing phases to detect points of confusion and necessary process improvement • The level of institutional adoption and sustained use of the released universal form will indicate initial acceptability. Ongoing feedback from users (institutional and faculty representatives) will ensure continued improvement ***Expected Benefit*** One benefit of a universal Conflict of Interest form is that faculty will be more accepting of it since it will be consistent across institutions as well as endorsed by the FDP (and therefore several Federal agencies). It will also provide a commonality that encourages an ERA solution (database and routing) due to the fact that it could be more easily transferred among institutions making use of the form.
C.3	New Mexico State University	Comparison of successful training modules for faculty and staff in compliance issues. How many institutions have mandatory training? Can training be successful without being mandatory from the top?
C.1		Assessment of the areas of compliance required by federal regulation should be undertaken along with the specific requirements and cost impact to universities of each. As has been recently suggested by other universities, a review of the administrative and scientific areas of compliance should be involved in order to assign compliance "priority" to each area. For example, human subjects compliance is certainly a higher priority than effort reporting. In addition, it would be useful to assign implementation dates to the compliance areas in relation to the implementation date of the administrative cap, to assess any additional compliance requirements put into place after the cap. It is understandable that the federal government needs to ensure that federal fund are used properly, however it is difficult to understand how universities are to pay for ever increasing compliance needs without addition funding. It is clear that either the compliance requirements need to be reduced or the funding for compliance requirements increased in order for the research mission of universities to continue to be effective.
C. 2,A.5	University of Minnesota	**Online Compliance**. We have been heavily involved in developing online compliance modules (Conflict of Interest, RCR) and would like to partner with the FDP in areas involving further development of these modules, helping other institutions set up programs by sharing our systems, and joining with others to convince federal agencies that some of the regulations are too burdensome. Having readily-available online compliance forms will reduce administrative costs and improve accuracy and timeliness.
C.2c	University of Rochester	**Problems Associated with Just-in-Time (JIT) Review:** While we applaud NIH's implementation of JIT for review of human subjects research, it is apparent that universities do not always receive ample notice of funded awards in order to plan accordingly for review. While UR was recently able to accommodate a two-week review window, smaller institutions that do not have multiple boards may find this very difficult. For instance, if an IND is still pending at the FDA, a two-week deadline may be impossible. Our recommendation would be to work with NIH and other agencies to find a consistent method of notification to grantees (each NIH institute seems to have its own process) that provides for ample review time (e.g., 30 days). Measure of success would be easily indicated in a survey instrument sent to research administration offices and IRB's. Expected benefits would be a more reasonable expectation for turn around and ample time for in-depth review.
C.3	The University of Texas at Arlington	We would also like to see pilot projects in the standardization of compliance training. When the RCR resurrects we would like to participate in pilot projects that may develop around the nine training areas. As an example, we believe that FDP can implement pilot projects for the mentoring area of the RCR and that all FDP members can benefit from procedures developed and implemented in this area.
C.3	Texas A& M University	Creating a Responsible Conduct in Research Module. Texas A&M, along with other research institutions, has received notice of a propos ed new rule from the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), currently suspended, but likely to be re-instated, effective in 2003, which will

		require all investigators to complete a training program in responsible conduct in research. These new federal requirements are indicative of the growing interaction of federal-funding agencies with the University as a whole and, specifically, the funded researcher and research staff. These requirements also have administrative and functional implications on the University and the office of the Vice President for Research. Currently, each of these training requirements are handled independently, and there is no systematic approach on the part of the University to address these requirements. Suggested methods/approaches The area of research compliance is complex and is further complicated by the different groups of responsibility in their respective areas. Further, there are many areas of overlap among and between the three large functional areas (animal, human subjects, and ethics), which would benefit from a concerted effort to coordinate the requirements (both federal and local) with regard to the training. Utilizing the general philosophy of completing the requirements using the most effective, state-of-the-art training modalities available to this institution, and being sensitive to the recipients of this training, the following specific recommendation is offered: Coordinate with others on campus to develop, fund, and implement a comprehensive and coordinated training program, using the most advanced technologies available, meeting all of the requirements promulgated from federal entities, and designed to provide basic, intermediate and advanced education and training, in all the functional areas to all faculty, staff, and students involved in the research enterprise at Texas A&M and the components located locally. The number of faculty, staff, and students that complete the training will assess impact of this program. The benefits of a coordinated educational effort will be to comply with emerging federal legislation, centralize administrative record keeping, and to provide researchers at Texas A&M multiple training resources on responsible conduct of research.
C.3	University of California-Systemwide	Assist in the development of training modules accessible to all FDP members to meet this increasing regulatory burden: Institutions are individually creating their own training modules to meet regulatory compliance requirements. The creation of a central database of approved models which can be used by any FDP member would greater streamline and facilitate this work. In addition, training programs could be jointly developed by committees of representative institutions.
C.3	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Researcher and Staff Training**:** Another issue soon to face UALR is the requirement for training in the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR). As mentioned above, UALR is nearing completion on the restructuring of the IRB. The process continues to be time consuming and labor intensive. The anticipated increase in staff and faculty training that will be precipitated by changes in federal regulations for accountability in the RCR will further deplete person hours and resources. Developing a training program in RCR will be eased by interaction with federal representatives to establish clear objectives and expectations as well as sharing ideas and training models with research organizations that are solving similar problems.
C.3	University of California- Los Angeles	We suggest that a Task Force be created to review the various aspects of RCR (Responsible Conduct of Research) and what can be done to assist institutions in implementing federal regulatory requirements. The focus of such a group could be to review training modules already developed by individual institutions and create an universal training module that could be shared, allowing institutions to draw on the combined strengths of the FDP group.
C.3, c.2.b	University of Georgia	1. RCR Compliance - developing pilot standardized training programs 2. Conflict of Interest - develop standardized disclosure, review, and reporting processes
C.3,C.1	University of Kansas and the KU Center for Research, Inc. (KUCR)	University of Kansas would like to see additional effort spent on the Responsible Conduct of Research. In anticipation of the reinstatement of federal guidelines we have begun to prepare for RCR, but many questions will be left unanswered. The FDP could help organize individual federal agencies' responses to make them consistent while assisting the universities in defining, developing and implementing suitable training programs to meet the requirements. Realizing that some universities have already developed their own training programs, we should have experts that could jointly help to develop RCR training modules to be used and tested in the university setting. Time and funding are always problems for university research administrators, and it would be helpful if the FDP could help to provide these modules as a minimum starting point for

		universities that have not had the time or resources to develop their own. Gathering information such as number of people tested, effectiveness of the training programs for comprehension and overall impact and acceptance from the faculty of our institutions would be very important. At our campus the real hurdle is selling the need for training at all. The term "federal mandates" has become a springboard for demonstration-like responses from some of our faculty.
C.3	University of Massachusetts Medical School	Effective compliance with federal regulations including stewardship of federal funds, protection of research subjects, appropriate use of animals, safety, and research integrity hinges upon training of faculty in each of these areas. Formalized training programs have been mandated by federal agencies in the area of research subjects. Investigator training for other areas has not yet been mandated by the federal agencies, but continues to be discussed as a new regulatory initiative. In addition, federal representatives and University research administrators recognize that effective Investigator training programs, while not mandatory, represent good practice in terms of assuring research compliance. The FDP could play a key role in developing training programs in collaboration with federal agencies and minimizing redundant efforts to develop such programs on individual campuses. The FDP could also explore developing electronic systems to track Investigator training and/or institutional assurances for training programs.
C.1	University of Massachusetts-Lowell	One of the greatest challenges facing research institutions is the escalating costs of compliance. These costs are borne entirely by the institution with little to no relief from the federal government. This challenge is particularly compelling fox small to mid sized institutions (particularly public) in an environment of diminishing financial and human resources. The mantra of the 90's in research administration was "Doing More With Less" -as -we enter the new millennium, the mantra seems to be "Doing More, Getting Le$$." One study could look at ways of simplifying administrative burdens placed on research institutions. We perform many tasks that could be eliminated without sacrificing accountability. A review of compliance tasks could be done to assess which make sense and which don't. At a recent meeting in the Boston area, the following questions were posed to an audience of Research administrators: Which regulations are the most burdensome? What is the goal of each of these regulations? Does the regulation achieve the goal? If not, is there a better way, i.e. more efficient or more effective, to achieve the goal? The FDP provides the perfect forum to address these questions, the answers to which can result in a potential demonstration or pilot project.
C.3	University of Massachusetts-Boston	The recent issues surrounding IRBs and Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) have resulted in a number of programs being developed for administrators and investigators including the recently released “Investigator 101” CD Rom distributed by OHRP. One possible project would be the development of (xx) which would lay out for investigators in broad terms their responsibilities and their institutions responsibilities as recipient of federal funds. Examples of content would include allowability criteria in A-21, including discussion of administrative expense(F&A), an overview of the requirements imposed on institutions in A-110, information on cost sharing and effort reporting, etc. This issue impacts most if not all institutions and a product developed under the auspices of the FDP with federal input could have significant creditability with investigators.

Topic	University	Proposed Demonstration
D.	**Research Management Issues**	
D.1	Cost Sharing	
D.2	Effort Reporting	
D.3	Proposals and Review	
D.4	Subawards and Awards a. streamline and eliminate the lengthy delay involved in the transfer of grants between institutions b. pilot a number of improved mechanisms for contracting between universities and the federal government.	
D.5	Audit and Financial Issues a. Financial interactions between institutions and sponsors b. Create standardized format for financial reporting and payment c. Compliance through effective A-133 audits d. Best Practices and Cash Management for P-Card Transactions e. Recovering Full Costs of Tuition and Fees for Federally Supported Fellowships and Training Grants f. Eliminate project financial status reporting (SF269) g. Just in Time Budgeting	
D.6	Standard Terms &Conditions a. Expanded authorities to all assistance activities covered by OMB A-110	
D.7	PL106-107 Model working groups	
D.8	Federal Outcomes Reporting Format	
D.9	Misc. a. Develop and test a single small business plan and reporting process b. Study could examine “just-in-time” (JIT) procedures to identify and promote best practices c. Develop shared solutions to support cross-cutting scientific programs(“Big Science”) d. The relationship between the VA, Universities and VA Foundations e. Sharing Knowledge with Minority Institutions f. Efficient processing and management of grants & contracts received from state & local government agencies g. The Administrative Overhead Recovery Cap h. Review & determine a pilot to reduce cost of the increasing federal regulatory burden i. The requirements of the state clearinghouse (under executive order 12372)	
D.10	Have the current administration affirm the final PRD Report especially the core apolitical principles of a valued partnership.	
D.1	Wayne State University	Cost sharing is an area that is impacted by the effort reporting requirement. Additionally, an interpretation of NIH “over-cap” salary as a cost sharing commitment expands the already growing levels of cost sharing. The ability to provide documentation of cost sharing only when required by programmatic guidelines as well as a different interpretation of the NIH salary cap situation would alleviate much of today’s paperwork.
D.2	Brown University	One burden that appears suited for reengineering or administrative streamlining is that associated with effort reporting and certification. The problem is to create a mechanism to fairly apportion the proper amount of committed effort (time and cost) to the research base of the institution and to determine that the cost for effort being directly charged to federally funded projects is fair and reasonable. The administrative processes however, currently required for meeting these intended results are so cumbersome and ineffective that the result often diminishes or discourages true accountability. The large volumes of paper and administrative effort needed to maintain the process takes valuable time away from research staff and principal investigators. This drives up cost and reduces productivity without creating a clear and demonstrable added value.
D.2	California Institute of Technology	Effort reporting remains one of the most vexing requirements for recipients of federal research funds. At the very first session of FDP III, effort reporting was identified as the area in which the greatest

	California Institute of Technology	improvements in grants management might be made. Unfortunately, relatively little progress occurred, despite heroic efforts by a number of FDP participants. Caltech proposes to continue to work within the FDP to seek alternatives to the present effort reporting systems. This is an area that lends itself to an FDP demonstration. The challenge is to come up with a demonstration that doesn't create more work and bureaucracy than the effort reporting system itself.
D.2	Dartmouth College	Dartmouth will continue to work to revise the current effort reporting process to a more meaningful system that provides for accountability without forcing faculty to perjure themselves. We have rolled out the new process in two areas of the university and will continue the process until all schools are using the new system. We will evaluate the process at the end of two years. We anticipate that DHHS Auditors will also conduct a review to be sure the process is in compliance with A-21 and to see if there is any loss of documentation for cost sharing.
D.2	University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio	Effort reporting continues to be a burden on faculty and staff who contribute time or are paid from federal funds. Even though some private institutions are developing new effort systems that appear to alleviate some of the burden, for state-supported colleges and universities, effort reporting must still be done on an individual basis, particularly for the purposes of calculating the contributed effort portion of the MTDC base in the F&A cost proposal. FDP III began with the faculty representatives urging the FDP to do something about effort reporting. While there was a demonstration planned, that demonstration was put on hold during the Presidential Review Directive hearings and report. As originally proposed, the demonstration would suspend effort reporting at participating institutions in lieu of programmatic analysis of the research results. We suggest that the effort reporting demonstration be resurrected and would be pleased to participate in the initiative.
D.2	Washington University	The University currently maintains a complex effort reporting system that involves numerous reporting cycles and periods throughout the fiscal year. The central administrative and academic departments generate, process, track and file approximately 16,000 effort reports each fiscal year. The system is compliant with OMB Circular A-21, but the cost/benefit of maintaining it is unclear to the faculty and staff within the University's research enterprise. The University supports projects that would streamline the effort reporting process such as a paperless effort reporting system or a once-a-year confirmation of effort for all employee types. The expected benefits to these revisions would be a reduction in the administrative effort (central administrative and academic departments) and/or a more consistent set of effort reporting data.
D.2	Wayne State University	A second component that WSU is very interested in is the recording and reporting of effort. One aspect of this component is the impact of this process on cost sharing. Currently, WSU performs confirmation of effort based on the bi-weekly pay distribution. On the surface, this may appear to be adequate. However, it is fraught with deficiencies. But given the current interpretation of effort reporting and the state of WSU HR systems, it is the best we can provide. We believe that effort reporting can be streamlined so that certification can be made at the end of each program. This certification, along with adequate program results and/or deliverables, should be adequate to support the personnel charges.
D.3	University of Texas, Medical Branch	*Problem/burden to be studie*d: Increasingly, federal sponsors are seeking to maximize the impact of their award dollars and reduce their administrative burden. This is done by constructing large-scale, multi-institutional projects that often involve consortiums of universities, industry, and non-profit partners. Such consortiums are complex, time-consuming and often challenge the lead institution's resources to the point that PIs become dissuaded from applying for these types of

		projects. *Suggested methods/approache*s: Develop an organizational model that offers centralized support for large scale grant projects, PPGs, etc. This centralized support would work with faculty to develop budgets, gather required proposal documentation, serve as a source of expertise regarding sponsor expectations and requirements, dialogue with consortium partners, and provide "nuts and bolts" assistance when needed. *Ways to assess the impact:* This can be done through the institution's database by: a) developing a standard identifier in the proposal/award title, and/or; b) adding a field in the database. In this way a direct correlation can be observed between all such proposals submitted and the success rate. An added benefit is that the institution can identify projects utilizing the support of the centralized office and compare rates of success to those not going through that office. *Expected benefits:* Anticipated benefits could be: a) PIs developing a confidence level that persuades them to build alliances and aggressively compete for these types of awards; b) receipt of larger dollar awards for the lead institution; c) establishment of a partnership infrastructure that can successfully compete for more awards of a similar nature; d) institutional identification of a concept that moves beyond reliance on the traditional "one faculty, one proposal" effort; e) development of valuable university infrastructure, including centralized institutional information for grant development, linking spreadsheets for complex budget development and intranets for multi-institutional collaborations.
D.3	University of Virginia	While we offer no specific or detailed demonstration/pilot project for Phase IV, we would support the continued attempt to streamline electronic processes across agencies, according to the strictures of PL 106-107 and the continuing development of the Federal Commons. We would further suggest that general consideration be given to the possibility of streamlining such activities as the closeout process, continuations, and multi-year proposals, so that these areas might become standardized across federal agencies.
D.3	Washington State University	We believe that more efficient management and distribution of funding opportunities and information from federal and non-federal agencies to the research faculty of WSU could achieve significant benefits. With the exception of a few expensive national funding databases that serve as a central location for all major federal and non-federal agencies, there are currently no university-operated databases or websites that contain information on these funding opportunities available to WSU faculty, free of charge. As the principal distributor of funding information for WSU, the Office of Grant and Research Development (OGRD) proposes to create a web-based database containing funding opportunities. The database will enable WSU faculty to search through funding sources based upon academic discipline, research interest, and funding amount. Impact will be assessed and monitored through the number of proposals submitted to the agencies. It is anticipated that with an increase in the number of proposal submittals, the expected benefits will be an increase in the amount of awards to WSU from these sources.
D.4	California Institute of Technology	Caltech proposes to continue its participation in the Subaward demonstration until the completion of that activity. The preliminary results of this demonstration seem highly promising. However, there are many eligible FDP institutions not yet participating. In addition, the demonstration should be expanded to include subaward agreements between FDP and non-FDP institutions. As collaborative research efforts are encouraged and expanded, the ability of participants to efficiently and effectively issue and administer subawards is extremely important.
D.4	University of Texas Health Science	We propose to expand the expanded authorities to all assistance awards, regardless of type. The OMB Circular A-110 revision of 1993

	Center at San Antonio	allowed agencies to exempt research awards from certain prior approval requirements known as the expanded authorities. Some agencies have chosen to allow the expanded authorities on only a portion of their awards. This demonstration would make the expanded authorities applicable to all awards. This would have broad impact on both the agencies and the awardees in reducing the administrative burden with little impact on the programmatic benefits of the funded programs. The expected benefits of the demonstration would be another step in making award terms and conditions common across agencies and programs.
D.4	University of Wisconsin - Madison	As a result of FDP, we have automatic carryover on many, but not all, types of awards. If automatic carryover works at NIH for R01s, FDP could pilot expanding carryover to other types of awards.
D.4	University of West Florida	Another demonstration that would be applicable to both peer reviewed awards and to appropriations is a standardized set of outcome measures so that the return from federal R&D investment in the higher education research enterprise can be measured on a consistent basis. A task force could be charged with this complex but critical project.
D.4	Washington State University	Lastly, we are initiating a pilot project will streamline the processing and monitoring of sub-awards. WSU and the University of Idaho have discussed the possibility of using Master Agreements to facilitate this process. In addition WSU personnel and the University of Washington Subcontract Administrator have initiated discussions about the possibility of managing subcontracts electronically — either by e-mail attachments or on the web. These processes will greatly relieve the burden of negotiating separate sub agreements, will reduce postage costs, and increase efficiencies.
D.4	Washington University	During last three fiscal years, the University has experienced a large surge in subagreements involving sponsored funding. Our records indicate that the number and dollar volume of these agreements has increased by 111% and 89%, respectively. As a result of this level of activity, the central administrative units and the academic departments have encountered difficulties and delays in resolving a myriad of subagreement terms and conditions. The University strongly supports FDP's current and future development of a standard set of subagreement terms and conditions. Standardizing the subagreement process would significantly reduce administrative costs and document turnaround times at both grantee and subgrantee institutions. The University also supports efforts to electronically transmit subagreement invoices and payments to/from institutions.
D.4	Yale University	Problem: With increasing frequency, we have seen that leading-edge science involves interdisciplinary research and collaboration among scientists in diverse fields. Thus it is not surprising that collaborations between scientists at DOE-funded federal laboratories and scientists at universities are becoming more common. This is especially true as the labs extend scientific inquiry beyond high energy physics into areas such as genomics and nanotechnology. In addition to the obvious benefits of the combined intellectual skills of collaborating scientists, these interactions allow for leveraging of scarce financial resources. The traditional method for resource sharing between academic scientists in these situations is through issuance of a subcontract or subaward by the primary grantee to the collaborator's home institution. Federal agencies, such as NSF and NIH, prefer to have one lead institution take responsibility for an award. A major problem arises, however, when a university receives an award from a federal agency other than DOE, for a project with a collaborator from a DOE-funded national laboratory such as Brookhaven, or Los Alamos National laboratory. DOE document DOE M 481.1-1A l Reimbursable Work for Non-Federal Sponsors Process Manual defines as non-federal all work for non-Department of Energy/non-National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) entities by DOE/NNSA/contractor (defined as the organization holding the DOE contract

		to run a facility) personnel and/or the use of DOE/NNSA facilities that is not directly funded by DOE/NNSA appropriations. The document was apparently intended for something other than collaborative research agreements; however, it must be used by the facilities whenever the sponsor of the research is not DOE. Many of the required clauses are inconsistent with projects in which the prime grantor is a federal agency and the prime grantee (and hence sponsor of the work) is a non-profit educational institution. For example, the document would require an advance payment to the facility equal to 90 days of costs. Since most grants and contracts to universities are on a cost basis and are subject to federal cash management regulations with regard to drawdowns of funds in excess of those needed, this clearly represents a significant problem. Further requirements that a sponsor indemnify the federal government, the Department of Energy and the contractor running the federal installation against any and all claims arising out of the research are unreasonable even for a for-profit sponsor. Needless to say negotiation of these issues is problematic, not infrequently contentious and lengthy resulting in unnecessary delays in valuable scientific investigation. Method: Create a team consisting of representatives from DOE, the national laboratories and universities to 1) Review the guidance and the rationale for the DOE "work for others" requirements. 2) Review the requirements other federal agencies place on prime grantees in their interactions with subawardees. 3) Develop simplified terms for subagreements between universities and national laboratories. This agreement can be modeled after the FDP university to university subagreement developed in Phase III of the project. Benefit: Time to agreement would be decreased. There would be an increase in scientific collaboration between facility scientists and university scientists. New sources of funding would flow to the facility scientists enabling more research than might have been possible solely with DOE funding. Assess Impact: 1) Time to agreement by comparison with previous experience. a. Decrease in person hours to reach agreement. 2) Investigator satisfaction as measured by questionnaire. 3) Increase in federal flow through dollars to facilities.
D.4,D.9	Florida International	Modular grants are not less work for the University. They were billed as a method to ease the proposal development process by eliminating detailed budgets, and as a tool for simplifying budget transfers and post award administration. The reality has been that you still need to develop a detailed budget to get to your modular amount, and the FDP and expanded authority has already simplified the budget transfer process. The modular process seems an unnecessary step in the proposal submission to NIH. Also, it is not applied consistently. despite the standing rule that all proposals submitted to NIH are supposed to be modular, we have had several program people at NIH tell us not to worry about it for a specific submission. The requirements of the state clearinghouse (under executive order 12372) are too burdensome. Not all Universities are complying, and there has already been discussion of its elimination. Close-out procedures should be streamlined to avoid Universities having to send copy of reports to both the funding agency and the cognitive reporting agency.
D.5	California Polytechnic State University/California Polytechnic State	The Cal Poly Foundation currently participates in an annual A-133 audit performed by Glenn, Burdette, Phillips & Bryson. The cost of this audit is approximately $15,000 in addition to the staff time involved to support the auditor's requests and requirements. Cal Poly is also audited by the Chancellor's Office of the California State University with annual costs at approximately $25,000 plus staff time. While checks and balances are a necessary part of any business, the audit function and requirements of federally funded projects and the CSU should be reviewed. There are redundancies and cost inefficiencies with the duplicative audit function that currently exists. The Cal Poly Foundation is interested in streamlining the audit process; by doing so, substantial benefits in the form of cost savings and staff

		efficiencies would be realized.
D.5	Colorado State	Work with the Audit community regarding proper use of Purchasing Cards on federally funded projects. Problem: Use of credit cards (purchase cards) to make purchases for federal projects presents challenges with regards to proper documentation of allowability, as well as retention of purchase documentation in a way that links to specific project records. Suggested methods: Assemble a pilot group of representatives from universities and the audit community to collect information from Universities currently allowing credit card purchases on federal projects. Collect best practice procedures on card usage, documentation requirements and procedures, record retention practices etc, to be approved as acceptable by the audit community. The topic of electronic scanning as a method of record retention and retrieval could also be included in this pilot study. Ways to assess the impact: Being able to provide guidance in an area of great confusion would be a measure of success. Documentation of best practices could be the end result. Expected benefits: Having an auditor sanctioned process for using credit cards to make purchases on federal projects would remove the risk of disallowances due to improper documentation/justifications and record retention for this type of purchase. Electronic procurement is only going to increase in the future and universities are implementing practices that will eliminate paper purchase documents.
D.5	Columbia University	Consolidated Project Management (CPM) system The Columbia University team proposes to create a consolidated project management system in order to cope with the problem of effective management, both financial and technical, of multiple proposals focused on similar goals of a single laboratory managed by a single principal investigator. In the current situation, each principal investigator who runs a large laboratory typically has three to five concurrent proposals, often from different FDP sources. Even though these proposals cover different aspects of common themes, they are managed in a stovepipe fashion, as though different parts of the same laboratory are arbitrarily divided into completely separate and independent components, according to funding source. This situation creates considerable burden on PI's, and requires that PI's spend time in the task of juggling funding rather than research, teaching, or training graduate students. In addition to the scientific burden, there is a financial burden to tease apart related expenses purely for the goal of satisfying requirements. Our proposal is to create a front-end combined account for a test set of at least four, and hopefully six, principal investigators (per institution) that fulfill the following criteria of having (a) at least two, and preferably three, different sources of funding for related but not overlapping research; (b) a large enough laboratory to support this CPM system experiment; (c) an open mind to try something new; (d) existing excellent financial support at the departmental level; and (e) an involvement in interdisciplinary research. The first three criteria are obligatory, and the second two are optional. In our test, we will create a uniform financial statement which reflects the funding which is active "behind the scenes". In our proposed demonstration, institutions will create a uniform financial statement which reflects the funding which is active "behind the scenes" for all FDP pieces of the pie. This could be thought of as a

		Wizard of Oz experiment, where the PI sees the bottom line of combined funding, for the purpose of his or her laboratory management. The participating federal agencies will agree to co-mingle their funds for the purposes of this demonstration. The institution will be able to draw down funds as required from a centralized pot of funds, reflective of the combined funding for the particular investigator(s). The demonstration will be deemed a success if: (a) the participating PI's conclude that the combining of research resources allows them to devote significantly less time to administration without any adverse effects on other aspects of their research effort; (b) the participating institutions conclude that the combined reporting simplifies the process; (c) the federal agencies conclude that based on their review of the technical progress report, they are satisfied as to the progress of the research, and that the lack of discrete financial accounting for each grant does not adversely affect their ability to judge the value of their investment.
D.5	Dartmouth College	We would like to propose that the Basic Assistant Award Task Force be reestablished. The past accomplishments of this Task force could be built upon to develop a new award mechanism "to provide sufficient funding and flexibility to enable an investigator to pursue unique research opportunities in his/her identified area of research."* The NIH Modular Grant concept is a step in the direction of the Basic Assistant Award, but a new Task Force could design a demonstration that would apply to all agencies and working with the Effort Reporting Task Force, incorporate ideas from their proposed demonstration. The anticipated result would be a streamlined process that would give researchers more time to do research.
D.5	University of Texas, Medical Branch	*Suggested methods/approaches:* Selected universities, as well as selected individual grants and contracts officers at DHHS, would run a trial comparison by tracking the amount of time devoted to the preparation and review of the two reports. *Ways to assess the impact:* DHHS would analyze the additional value it perceived as a result of receiving the two types of financial reports. Additionally, a cost/benefit analysis could be performed on the number, or types of mistakes or problems caught by virtue of receiving the additional report. *Expected benefits:* It's anticipated that a successful comparison will reveal that the present DHHS requirement for submission of an SF 269 adds only marginal value to the SF 272 process. Additional benefits are likely to be: a) elimination of duplicative effort; b) standardization and consistency in reporting requirements between the federal governments two largest supporters of sponsored research; c) opportunity for institutions and sponsors to focus on compliance and audit functions in order to address other priorities and streamline administrative functions; d) substantial reduction of paper; e) establishment of electronic solutions that more adequately complement the evolving research environment, and; f) an enhanced operational function among university staff.
D.5	University of Wisconsin - Madison	OMB has spent considerable time and effort building the A-133 Audit Clearinghouse, but universities and federal agencies alike are not using it to its fullest extent. FDP could improve efficiency by making this system standard. NSF has eliminated financial reporting at the end of the project period and relies on the information that is supplied in the quarterly report. FDP should investigate if other agencies could implement similar procedures.
D.5	Washington University	Cash management of federal funds has been complicated over the last several years by the development of agency specific payment/reporting systems. The proliferation of identification numbers, passwords, cash draw methodologies and expenditure reporting requirements has created data

		security, internal control and staff training issues. Proper application of payments from these individual systems has also been hampered because the transaction data received is very limited. Accordingly, the University strongly supports FDP projects/efforts to develop a common payment mechanism that all the federal agencies and grantees could utilize. A single payment system would streamline the cash management and reporting requirements for both the grantee and the federal agencies.
D.6	Case Western Reserve University	Cost limitations on grants increases research burden for faculty researchers by affecting support staffing and students. A pilot project would analyze the effect of reducing cost limitations on selected budget items on progress in research (number of total publications, completion of specific aims, generation of new research projects).
D.6	Colorado State	Share information between FDP institutions to find a solution to streamlining preparation of an annual report required by EPA called the "Minority Business/Women Business Utilization" or MBE/WBE report. Problem: This report is burdensome to prepare because it involves looking at individual purchases made for a project and the status of the supplier to report the $$ procured and the percent that are MBE/WBE purchases. This is a difficult report to prepare accurately and CSU is seeking a programming solution. Suggested method/approach: Work with the EPA to see if this could be an institutional report for all awards rather than a report for each award individually. Seek input and guidance from other FDP institutions that have already found an automated solution to producing this report. Ways to assess the impact: Automated production of this report, either by grant or by institution would demonstrate success in this task. Expected benefits: Direct benefit to the faculty member and their staff who won't have to produce this report manually.
D.6	Dana Faber Cancer Institute	One of the goals of the Research Administration Strategic Plan is to improve upon the development of a seamless organization between central and departmental administration. DFCI, a strictly centralized organization for the management of grants and contracts, approximately three years ago began the process of moving more grants management into the departments. Three years later the unifying of the grants management process between central and departmental administration has failed in some areas and succeeded to some degree in other areas. Looking back its clear where mistakes were made or opportunities not taken. Specifically, not all department chairs and administration bought into the process, administrative areas needing to be part of the process early on were left out, experience levels of staff in departments were varied, therefore, group training not always effective, a degree of “them vs us” mentality between central and departmental administration was allowed to exist creating barriers to forging a seamless operation. What needs to be done? Get buy in! Assess what is working and what is not working. Define roles and areas of responsibility. Determine training and education requirements and further determine if the training is required on a group or an individual basis. Determine who will provide the training, external or internal sources – if in house, need to develop training modules and find faculty, if external determine provider. Create opportunities for central and departmental administration to work together, thereby encouraging a process of collegiality and teambuilding. The impact and benefits of all of this will hopefully be less finger pointing, more collegiality, even distribution of grants management skills and understanding of grants policy, and better prepared grants. As I answer my umpteenth survey this year I am struck by how little value the results of this information will be to me at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. I find more and more surveys trying to capture more and more information some that might be of use, but more often than not will provide little help in my specific benchmarking needs. Not all cancer centers are alike, just like not hospitals are alike and not all universities are alike. As my institution goes through both a research and clinical strategic planning process, including a master space and building plan, I find I am gathering and massaging a large amount of Dana-Farber statistics measuring federal dollars per square feet, direct cost dollars per square feet, indirect cost dollars per square feet, FTE’s

		per square feet, faculty per square feet, core space allocations, space allocation by faculty – professor, associate professor, assistant professor, to identify a few areas. Although there volumes of statistics publicly gathered from which one could benchmark, it is never clear what criteria was used in capturing those statistics and if using them as a benchmark may be a comparison of apples with oranges. Of course, I could always put together my own survey and be selective of the responders but I wonder if other institutions are as perplexed about benchmarking data and if so would be possible as an FDP pilot project to bring together institutions with common backgrounds, small hospitals, large hospitals, small universities, large universities, cancer centers, research institutions, etc. to generate surveys and capture data specific to the needs of each group. Each group would agree to annually respond to a standard set of questions about their institution, results would be compiled and sent back to each group participant. This project would require targeted web based surveys and sponsor(s) to accept responsibility for the data that is captured, its compilation, and circulation. The expected benefits would be a set of benchmarks that adhere to a set of known standards.
D.6	University of Washington	As stated earlier in this application, we are currently in the process of creating an entirely electronic proposal and award management system. This system is a University-wide project, affecting the workload of all those involved in the grant and contract process, from the investigator to various central office administrators. Sharing our experiences with other institutions undertaking a project of this scope would undoubtedly be mutually beneficial. In addition, there are a few specific projects we will be beginning where coordination with institutions of all sizes would be advantageous to the research community as a whole. In addition, The post award office, Grant and Contract accounting (GCA), has a twelve year history of process improvement which has allowed them to streamline and provide metrics for all their systems. Process improvements initiated by GCA have improved speed of input into the financial legacy systems, improved cycle time on processes and improved customer service. GCA will be an important partner in any FDP initiatives, and may investigate a new cost sharing / effort reporting system and a new closing system that would allow campus departments and central staff to work jointly on the appropriate aspects of closing a grant. They are willing to share and/or collaborate with FDP partners. They will also be installing a JD Edwards receivable system in 2002/2003 and will be adopting it to invoice in the various sponsor formats. The second project we are interested in sharing information with our peers is the systemization of regulations. As we are developing our electronic grants and contracts management system, we are incorporating many business rules (including those set by the federal and state governments, as well as internal regulations) into the system. By automating various validation rules, not only will we eliminate the possibility that regulations may be overlooked or bypassed, the audit process will be simplified. We are very interested in how other institutions verify compliance with regulations, and look forward to sharing solutions we develop. Finally, as we are currently in the process of developing a large, university-wide system, we have discovered many small interim solutions that can reduce workload immediately, before all the features and functionality of the large system is completed. There is always a debate over whether to focus time and effort on interim solutions or whether it is better to forge ahead with as-is processes. While these decisions are ultimately up to the individual institution, we believe that in any process there are a few temporary fixes that would dramatically save more time than they require for implementation. An example of an interim solution that would benefit many is the ability to parse electronic notifications of awards. While we are developing a system that will be capable of receiving EDI, many pieces of the EDI puzzle are not available. By creating a batch process that strips out the pertinent award information and puts it into fields that can be imported into our database, we can improve the process significantly. This time savings could be further maximized if there was a centralized repository of these solutions to which all participating institutions could contribute as well as draw from to improve their own individual processes.

D.6	University of West Florida	A Phase IV demonstration that has been discussed by some of the Florida institutions involves the Federal appropriation process and its interface with the peer reviewed process of generating funding. While this is a somewhat controversial topic and a few institutions eschew the process, a clear majority of higher education institutions are significantly engaged in the lobby effort associated with appropriations and earmarks as the annual Chronicle of Higher Education data demonstrates. There has been significant interest from members of the Florida federal delegation regarding the process associated with the distribution of appropriated funds to a university through an agency. Concerns have been expressed regarding federal agency policies and procedures for handing the appropriation funding process and concerns are that the intent and funding level of the appropriation is often adjusted as it goes through the agency based distribution process. There is probably not a better organization in the U.S. than the FDP to undertake an analysis of the appropriation process and to negotiate standardized terms and conditions for handling post-appropriation administration.
D.6	EMORY	Although not a demonstration project, Universities would greatly benefit from uniform terms and conditions among the various Federal agencies. It would especially be helpful for the faculty who would not have to remember all "the different rules" for each federal agency, thereby being able to concentrate on their research. As we stated in our biennial report, Emory believes that FDP should focus its attentions on processes rather than policy. There are many organizations such as AAU, AAMC and COGR which assist the Universities with respect to matters of policy.
D.5	*Georgetown*	NSF's recent announcement that they may conduct agency-specific audits instead of relying on the OMB A-133 single audit is a concern to most universities. Agencies should review and amend A-133 if they are concerned that it lacks specific agency-level information. Georgetown University would be willing to select a representative to serve on any review committee.
D. 7	*Georgetown*	. The following is a suggestion rather than a plan for demonstration. To date, federal agency participation in the FDP has served the university community well. It has allowed FDP to be a forum for exchanging ideas and solutions on problems that affect both universities and federal agencies. It would be very helpful if other federal agencies that routinely issue grants could be encouraged to participate in FDP. Georgetown receives a considerable amount of funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State (specifically, the division that was the U.S. Information Agency) and the Department of Education. We suggest that the current agency participants help these other agencies become FDP members.
D.9	Johns Hopkins	The National Institutes of Health has expressed interest in developing a pilot for a single institutional Small Business Plan. Under such a process, a university would develop an overall small business plan for NIH awards to which it would comply in aggregate, rather than developing one plan per award. While initially this seems like a good idea, in actuality rather than decreasing the administrative burden at universities, it would augment the problem by creating a completely different method for accomplishing the planning and reporting for sponsored projects for NIH vs. other agencies. Therefore, we recommend that FDP design a demonstration to develop and test a single small business plan and reporting process that would be accepted across the board by all FDP agencies.
D.5,D.1,D.3	*Kent State University*	FDP might address electronic drawdown transactions. Kent's GR uses, where available, electronic Letter of Credit transactions. Considerable burden exists where this process is unavailable. The paper process means that invoice sare completed/mailed for individual grants. Paper copies must be maintained and mailing can be complicated with different addresses indicated for different invoices. Letter of Credit transactions allow bulk reimbursement of expenditures associated with agency awards instead of reimbursement by individual award. Two major benefit swould result if all agencies would follow the four permitting Letter of Credit transactions. Costs (invoicing time for individual grant expenditures, mailing) would be reduced/eliminated. Broader allowability of electronic drawdownof funds would collapse time between expenditure and reimbursement, saving money through cash flow availability.

		Reporting presents problems. To monitor performance/progress report due dates and ensure compliance, staff must check a paper trail. DOEd neither informs the institution as to report deadlines nor does it specify report deadlines in its award documents. NSF's terms indicate final/continuing project report due dates and SP staff can use FastLane to download PI reports. For annual reports, FastLane lists only Continuing Grant annual report due dates but not Standard Grant annual report (required by NSF Terms) due dates. Staff could save time in supervising compliance, if, for Standard Grants, NSF would provide such tracking capacity. The process could further improve if other agencies lacking the notification system of report obligation would adopt an NSF-like report system. Perhaps the FDP could continue to promote agency acceptance of an annual institutional submission of a single certification/assurance. The obvious burden is submission of these forms with each proposal, even the failed ones. We hope that the FDP will continue to work on funding announcement consistency. Recently, on the cover of two AMRMC announcements (Breast/Ovarian Cancer Programs), a date of March 13, 02 was given. Typically, a cover date is a closing date. The Ovarian Cancer Program deadline dates, June 18, 02, are not found until the fourth page. The Breast Cancer Program deadline date, June 4, appears on the fifth page. Expecting a cover page deadline date, one might have erroneously assumed the AMRMC closing date had passed on March 13 and that it would be too late and futile to inform faculty. To avoid a misreading by faculty recipients, SP staff entered correct closing dates on each cover. Omission of the closing date on the cover forces a search through the announcement. Were agencies to enforce "standardized" format presentation, this problem would be averted. Announcement descriptions of cost share are problematic. If cost sharing is not "required" but "encouraged," then how will proposals without cost share stack up against those stipulating it? How would a stellar proposal lacking cost share measure against one volunteering inordinate cost share? Is review fair when requirements are fuzzy? The problem is also economic. To make its proposal more competitive, should an institution provide cost share(juggling resources) in a case where an announcement states that "Proposers also are encouraged to offer cost sharing" as in a NASA Research Announcement closing April 02. Would committing cost share as encouraged use up institutional ability to commit cost share when required? Greater specificity should allow for greater process equity. FDP might probe NIH salary caps. Are our highest-paid researchers some of our best? Do we hinder their interest in performing federal research? If so, is this in the country's best interest relative to advancing biomedical research?
D.5,D. 9 b, D.9c	Massachusetts General Hospital	A pilot project focused on financial interactions between institutions and sponsors, as well as among institutions, could yield significant opportunities for streamlining. Development of a system that would facilitate the on- line reconciliation of institutional financial and programmatic information with sponsor data could result in significant savings. In particular, we are extremely interested in a system that will simplify interaction with the Federal Payment Management System (PMS). The effort involved in preparing PMS quarterly reports is almost exclusively manual. Further the linkage of this information to the sponsor program and grant management staff is limited. Considering the laborious reconciliation processes currently used to match the financial systems of the sponsor and the institution, this project falls high on our list of priorities. This reconciliation process is not only time-consuming but also a non- value-added step. In addition, our subrecipient/consortium colleagues should be included in this process. Institutions spend considerable effort overseeing the multiple steps of this process, including writing the agreement, preparing and receiving monthly billings, exchanging cash for these programs, and managing the financial reporting. Linking these activities through an electronic network would represent a significant time and cost savings for all parties. With ReX as a platform, we are better positioned to tackle challenges such as this than our colleague institutions. An FDP study could examine "just-in-time" (JIT) procedures to identify and promote best practices. Progress made in streamlining administrative steps related to JIT information collection may have been lost through proliferation of sponsor-specific "quick fixes" applied in pursuit of improved assurance of compliance. Sponsor-specific decisions to request unconventional documentation in support of IRB or IACUC approvals seem to undermine the institutional certification process. This additional effort has no proven added value. Demonstration of streamlined methods for assuring sponsors of timely IRB or IACUC approval may represent a big win for institutions and sponsors.

		There is an increasing emergence of cross-cutting scientific programs, across the traditional barriers of department and service lines and even institutional affiliation, including antibioterrorism, genomics, proteomics, nanotechnology, and computational biology. These collaborations demand greater connectivity among institutions. Effective management of these programs and of complicated multi-site clinical trials requires administrative capabilities that are not possible with traditional systems and processes. FDP institutions could develop shared solutions to support these programs. With the proliferation of "big science" initiatives, we need to develop better ways for institutions to collaborate, not just through the subaward agreement document, but through actual and transparent administrative efficiencies, including regional cores, shared educational programs, and shared systems.
D.6a	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	The current expanded authorities have been used by FDP schools for almost 10 years for most research projects. They are no longer experimental. One critical need is the expansion of the expanded authorities to all assistance activities covered by OMB A-110 with regard to (at least) institutions of higher education. Equally importantly is the removal of the option federal agencies have to not provide the expanded authorities to all the activities covered by A-110. Said another way, there should be no option provided to agencies (unless imposed bylaw) allowing them not to implement the expanded authorities across the board. The result would be to have only one system for assistance funding, which would substantially decrease administrative burden for both agencies and institutions.
D.4,D2,D.3	North Carolina State University	Standardization and digitization of subcontracting model between the 16 constituent institutions of the UNC System and agencies of the State of North Carolina will be implemented. The burden is clearly that adding state agencies to the mix of not only federal flow-through but also state appropriate grants and contracts with institutions of higher education is arduous and non-productive. Agreements must be renegotiated regularly. We expect to develop a model that is digital in nature and allows for the distribution of state and federal funds through state agencies to institutions of higher education to run in a highly effective manner. We can then showcase this model to other states. Our approach is to start local, as in the case of our standardization of subcontracting between sister institutions of the UNC System described below. The standardization of an FDP Subcontract, for example is too global and does not accommodate a large enough component of our business to be meaningful. Individuals from our post-award environment have been engaged to work with other FDP institutions in evaluating, recommending improvements or elimination of, and demonstrating compliance through revamped effort reporting and tracking methodologies. NCSU has a comprehensive digital approach to effort reporting but does not have a comprehensive let alone digital approach to other cost share tracking. Although our current cost share tracking approach is sound and withstands audit, it is not efficient and is troublesome to our clientele. We would like to determine a methodology by which cost sharing can be tracked with little effort or frustration by our faculty and reported to federal (and state) agencies in a consistent manner that accommodates the needs of our various constituents (sponsors, cost accounting, rate development and audit organizations to name a few).
D.8 D.1,D.2,D4	Northwestern	FDP should consider partnering with the PL 106-107 Post Award working group to review and clarify ambiguous sections of OMB Circular A-21. The lack of clarity leads to variability of interpretations among institutions and federal agencies. For example, a 1997 addition states that the negotiated F&A rates in effect at the time of award shall remain in effect throughout the award life and that award levels will not be adjusted in future years as a result of changes in negotiated rates. This has been interpreted by some to mean that the F&A rate which is awarded is the rate that should apply to expenditures, even if a new federally negotiated rate is in place. Others take this to mean that although no additional funds will be provided if a newly negotiated rate is higher than the rate awarded, funds can be rebudgeted and the new rate can be applied to expenditures. When Northwestern attempted to have this clarified by higher education consultants, colleagues at other institutions, and federal agency personnel, the responses were equally divided, with half saying that the current rate should always be used for expenditures and half saying that the awarded rate should apply. This is not helpful and could result in future audit disallowances if incorrect/bad advice has been given. Clarification of OMB Circular A- 21

		implementation is one of the top two issues that the FDP faculty representatives would like to have addressed in FDP IV. FDP could also serve as the forum to review and clarify the guidance provided to federal indirect cost negotiators. There is far too much variability between cognizant agencies and among regions within the same agency. This leads to uneven and in some cases, unfair treatment. Continue effort reporting/cost sharing,subaward, contract and foundation working groups and the ERA and Terms andConditions standing committees.
D.4	Pennsylvania State	Penn State will continue to give leadership in the subawards demonstration project
D.5, D.2 D. 8	Research Foundation for the State University of New York	*The RF suggests that FDP Phase IV should maintain a prominent role with the multiagency task force upon completion of their initial FFAMIA assessment.* *The RF suggests that FDP Phase IV develop an effort reporting demonstration – similar to that proposed during Phase III. The demonstration should test the elimination of effort reporting and its impact on the outcome of the sponsored research project* *The RF suggests that FDP Phase IV develop a reporting format demonstration – to describe actual project outcomes as the true benefits of the research program. Two federal agencies could be selected to design the format so agency program officers can assess the research outcomes to assure the federal government has received benefit from its investment in the sponsored program.*
D.5,D2	San Diego State University Foundation	Standardize federal final fiscal reporting requirements. We suggest a demonstration to show the duplication of effort where some federal agencies require both a final fiscal report SF 269 and a final federal transaction report SF 272 at the end of the budget period. Some federal agencies use the final federal transaction report SF 272 as the final fiscal report while other federal agencies require both, which is aduplication of effort; Eliminate the effort reporting process as required by the federal regulations. The process is labor intensive and a duplication of effort. The financial payroll systems for SDSU and SDSUF are separate; therefore the process is extremely labor intensive and costly
D. 6	University of Nebraska	Consistency of procedures and policies both in solicitations and awards between Federal agencies is extremely important to NU
D.2,	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	One of the most important pilots that was not completed under Phase III related to effort reporting simplification or elimination. It is critical that universities and government officials get together to try to simplify the process in the future for faculty. There are a few approaches that were discussed at the meetings that would work well. The expected benefits are enormous, mostly time savings for faculty and other personnel in the departments and central administration.
D.5	University of North Carolina, Wilmington	A single “Central Clearing House” for registering for payments of contracts and grants
D.5b	University of North Florida	Create standardized format for financial reporting and payment**.** **Problem**: The various federal agencies have different requirements for submission of financial reports. Most agencies require separate forms - some submitted electronically others transmitted through the mail. Similarly, the method of payment for federal grants and contracts vary by agency. **Suggested Methods/Approaches**: Create a standardized format and common portal for electronic submission of financial reports and invoicing for and receipt of payment on federal grants similar to the FDP demonstration project for electronic submission of proposals. **Ways to Assess Impact**: Measuring increased timeliness of report submission, reduction in time required for generating reports, better management of funds, and improved audit trail for expenditure. **Expected Benefits**: It would simply the accounting for federal funds and reduce the amount of time manually reentering data into various formats as accounting systems could be developed to account for and report on the receipt and expense of funds according to the standard federal format. A standard method for invoicing and receiving payments could improve management of funds and reduce the possibility of lost payments, overpayments, etc.

D. 5,D4	University of North Texas	consolidating options for payment management into something like the DHHS, Division of Payment Management system; more utilization of white paper pre-selection process to minimize time and frustration and success rate for faculty, and globalizing NIH's modular granting process to other federal agencies to minimize time spent creating and justifying budgets that could be better spent on developing programs
D.2	University of Pennsylvania	A. Effort Reporting: 1) Project: Eliminate effort reporting--Accounting measures of salary spent is only an approximation of effort expended and has a limited correspondence to researchers' effectiveness. We should return to the underlying first principles of grant support. Grants are assistance mechanisms for a body of research and not procurement of faculty time for research services for the use of the government. a. Assessing Impact: Measure effectiveness of grant funding through scientific results and peer-reviewed publications. b. Expected Benefits: Among the expected benefits would be the elimination of complicated percentage of effort calculations especially for capped NIH salaries; an elimination of meaningless measures of government benefit as a function of faculty salaries paid; reduction of faculty angst and administrative burden. Most institutions have 1-2 accounting clerks tracking submission of effort reports or utilize costly software solutions for tracking. These resources could be better used elsewhere, especially in areas which in today's climate need additional resources **B. Financial Status Reporting:** **1) For multicenter/institution grants NIH and other federal agencies should extend reporting time to give each sub-recipient 90 days to submit its report to the prime awardee. Many complex project FSR's are already submitted late or if timely, then revisions must be made as final adjustments are made by sub-recipients and primes. As a practical matter there is little information difference between late FSR's and those that are timely but have to be revised because of salary adjustments or unliquidated obligations.** **a. Assessing Impact: Federal agencies could perform statistical analyses of timely FSR's and analyze frequency of revisions thereafter. A pilot study would compare the accuracy of "extended time" FSR's and subsequent revisions compared to a set of timely FSR's and subsequent revisions.** **b. Expected Benefits: More accurate FSR's with fewer revisions.** **2) Permit carryover of unobligated balances on NIH Program Projects and the like and eliminate the need for annual financial reporting. Harmonize FSR procedures with R01's and the like so that the efficiencies gained in the financial management of these kinds of projects can be transferred to the larger more complex projects.** **a. Assessing Impact: Compare spending rates and scientific progress on program projects with annual fiscal reporting requirements to those without.** **b. Expected Benefits: Fewer FSR submissions and less administration for NIH grants management personnel.** **3) Eliminate the need to submit FSR's. The NSF has eliminated the need to submit Financial Status reports. Other Federal agencies should adopt this means of financial reporting.** **a. Assessing Impact: Details of expenditures are available upon request from the grantee.** **b. Expected Benefits: Increased efficiencies at both the institutional and**
D.4a	University of South Florida	A proposed pilot project to seek ways to streamline and eliminate the lengthy delay involved in the transfer of grants between institutions. Currently, the process is extremely labor intensive and slow. A research project can be delayed many months while administrative processes are finalized between relinquishing and receiving institutions and the federal agency. **Methods**: The participants of the pilot project would map the workflow involved in transferring a research grant to determine what efficiencies could be built into the process or what steps could be eliminated or added in order to streamline the process. One idea for facilitating financial reporting would be to allow the use of estimates of the award balance remaining at the sending

		institution rather than the actual final balance, with the understanding that final reconciliation would be completed once the transfer was accomplished. **Assessing the Impact**: Data would be collected from the participating institutions and federal agencies and analyzed to determine the impact on the research project and all parties. **Benefits:** Enhanced capabilities for a more timely and smooth transition, ensuring continuity of the research at the receiving institution, ultimately lending to a more successful project; specifically, reduction of the frustration experienced by the principal investigator during the transfer process and reduction of the administrative burden · **Problem**: Task Force to review the costing principles of A-21 as it relates to basic research vs. other types of sponsored projects. There is a need to distinguish between basic research studies vs. other types of sponsored projects in OMB A-21. For example, evaluation studies, many social science studies, education studies, demonstration projects, training grants, and federal flow-through projects are subject to the same costing principles as are basic research awards. One aspect of this is that most of these projects are awarded limited F&A rates yet recipient institutions are held to the same costing principles as projects that typically will be awarded the full F&A rate. **Method**: Review A-21 regarding the need to clarify the types of sponsored projects and make recommendations to OMB regarding what should be an allowable cost for basic research vs. non-basic sponsored projects. An example is that most social science studies do not need special purpose equipment, just general-purpose equipment and supplies, to complete their goals and objectives; yet, general-purpose items are normally unallowable as direct costs. Assessing the Impact: Survey FDP members to determine the ratio of their basic research sponsored projects to other sponsored project funding. Complete a cost analysis to determine the cost implications of this clarification and its impact on both the Federal sponsors and the institutions. **Benefits**: This review could have long-range implications on the costing of all federal sponsored programs with advantages to both the federal agencies and the institutions.
D.6	University of Southern California	PROJECT 1. Review regulations applicable to assistance awards that are consistent across agencies. Request participation from university and federal members. 2. Determine those regulations that appear to be ineffective or superfluous or could be modified to make them more effective and consistent with experience and/or current practice or eliminated. Develop a survey instrument for distribution to FDP member institutions/agencies to assist in determining which regulations might be candidates for this project 3. Select the two or three regulations that would have the greatest burden-reducing impact. 4. Form a task/work force to rewrite/modify the selected regulations. 5. Have one or more iterations of sharing the results in draft form with FDP members for review and comments. 6. Seek approval from FDP member agencies and OMB. 7. Once approved, distribute to FDP members for implementation.
D.2	University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston	Discontinue or redesign existing Effort Reporting requirements. The current effort report tracking system places a burden on researchers and administrators to track. We propose to design a standard method of tracking effort based on completion of research aims, and to test implementation through a pilot project. We will assess success through the pilot and determine if benefits outweigh the costs of implementation.
D.4b, D.4,	Georgia Institute of Technology	Georgia Tech additionally volunteers to pilot a number of improved mechanisms for contracting between universities and the federal government. Certain contracting clauses, especially those related to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), impede scientific collaboration in certain fields of research due to strict interpretation of export control laws. We propose that FDP members examine how some government projects are hampered by improperly applied International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR) provisions. ITAR provisions in research awards are confusing and frequently have unintended consequences. A better understanding by universities and government representatives is needed. A recent example of

		how ITAR provisions, or their interpretation, is problematic occurred when a government project officer was reluctant to authorize a US scientist to go abroad to facilitate fabrication and shipping of a piece of foreign-manufactured instrumentation, and the US university was uncertain whether the travel required an export license. Other examples: • Some federal RFPs requiring foreign support state that an ITAR license may be required prior to discussing a proposed project with a potential foreign collaborator. • When foreign students develop technologies or other tools with significant potentiality, commercial sponsors are hampered by their belief that any information related to a foreign student must be covered by an ITAR license. It is not very farsighted to require that further development be limited to work by US citizens or that ITAR licenses be obtained by universities for such work. • Consider the case of a foreign national post-doc who wrote software for a US government funded project and submitted it to the government, only to have the sponsor determine that the software fell under ITAR restrictions. The author was required to obtain an ITAR license to read the government's comments on the work. • Some sponsors unnecessarily insist on a Technology Transfer Control Plan when foreign nationals participate in research or other defense-related work. Universities cannot easily comply, because it is not possible to anticipate which foreign nationals may participate in the future. These examples demonstrate the scope of the problems caused by misunderstandings and misinterpretations of export controls imposed on collaborations with foreign scientists and graduate students. We propose that the FDP examine this issue with an aim toward clarification of the fundamental research exclusion under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and to ensure that university collaborations are not impeded. Georgia Tech offers to participate in a study to address institutional obligations when universities accept these clauses and to determine their impact on student studies and intellectual property. Georgia Tech additionally offers to share a training program that we developed for our own research community. Georgia Tech offers to participate is related to intellectual property and the dichotomy between the government's traditional assertion of all ownership rights as opposed to sponsors' need to protect their own, potentially lucrative ideas. Areas of particular concern to universities are the subrecipient/flowdown issue, problems with the Department of Defense "other transactions" authority, and identification of background intellectual property. Georgia Tech would be pleased to join in a deliberation of these vital issues and to offer our resources to the discussion.
D.2,D.5,D.6	Harvard University	1) Effort Reporting/Cost Sharing Reporting--In our recent F&A base year cost proposal,we demonstrated through implementation of the OMB Committed Cost Sharing Interpretation of January 2001 that, in fact, cost sharing commitments by faculty are considerably less than effort reported by faculty. This study and resulting data allowed for us to include a much smaller amount of cost sharing in the denominator of our F&A calculation. 2) Elimination of the Disclosure Statement requirement--Although Harvard was the first HHS institution to have its DS-2 approved, there has been very little reference to this document from the federal government and our sponsors since its development and approval. In attempting to quantify the effort spent on the first round of our DS-2 development between internal staff time and consultants, we estimate a figure close to $200,000 (for what? one asks). With the federal government so far behind in its review and approval of DS-2s and with very little proven use for these documents, we would like to participate in an effort to eliminate this onerous requirement so we may have increased resources to focus on human subjects, RCR, and other more meaningful requirements (in our view). 3) Terms and Conditions: We would be interested in building on the work already done in this area by working to establish (a) guidelines so that terms applicable to service contracts, construction agreements or commercial

		agreements are not included in basic R&D solicitations; and (b) development of a process whereby each agency would review and justify its unique agency provisions so that "legacy" provision long out-of-date would not be perpetuated, provisions would be updated regularly and new provisions added on a timely basis. These efforts should reduce the time required for negotiations thereby allowing work to begin on a more timely basis and reduce administrative burden and costs for agency and university contracting offices. 4) Lastly, to reduce administrative burden, Harvard would be very interested in participating in an effort to revisit the A-21 methodologies currently described for space classification. Again just having completed our rate study, one entire FTE, several staff, faculty hours, and consultants were employed to document a precise accounting of space utilization--an effort that was much more easily accomplished without vastly different results using the predominant use of concepts in A-21 of a decade ago.
D.5,D.6	New Mexico State University	1. Caps of Facility and Administration (F&A) costs for various agencies such as the Department of Education cap of 8%. 2. The allowance of F&A to be used to meet cost share requirements on federalawards. 3. Standard interpretation of federal terms and conditions by prime awardees to subcontractors. Some of our subcontracts that are flow through awards are more restrictive than prime awards from the same agency.
D.1		**Cost Sharing** Problem: Despite recent policy revisions by OMB, confusion still surrounds costsharing definitions, relationship to effort reporting, and recording and accountability requirements. Faculty and administrative staff do not fully understand the impact on the institution or the reporting requirements and are distracted from program activities in attempting to meet compliance. Suggested Approaches: 1. Develop a set of clear definitions across multiple categories, such as personnel, equipment, F&A, etc. 2. Provide "case studies" to illustrate various types of cost sharing and provide examples of problem resolution. 3. Survey systems currently used (or under development) to document and reporting cost sharing and effort reporting. Review these with federal sponsors and partners to arrive at a range of acceptable standards and systems. 4. Conduct a pilot study with institutional representatives, including faculty groups, and evaluate in relation to each institution's practices. Expected Benefits: 1. Better understanding and acceptance of policies and procedures by faculty together with effective reporting systems by faculty will refocus effort on research productivity and reduce the administrative burden. At the same time, in Phase IV, FDP needs to press forward with its efforts to revise the cost sharing policies and requirements currently imposed by federal agencies.
D.6		. **Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)** Problem: Although the recently enacted HIPAA "final rule" on privacy standards significantly impacts all health care organizations, the regulations will affect most educational institutions in relation to biomedical, behavioral, and epidemiological research. The final privacy rule imposes new compliance standards on the current system of IRB review and oversight. It is clear, that many information management systems will need to be reengineered to comply with HIPAA. Approaches: Because many institutions are coping with interpreting and understanding the applicability of the rules, it may be premature to suggest a specific approach by FDP. Nevertheless, given the framework developed under PL106-107 by institutions and federal sponsors, FDP Phase IV could provide valuable guidance on the regulations and their implementation.

D.2,D.5	Northeastern	Project to evaluate the administrative burden of F&A proposal process, addressing areas of specific concern such as space usage issues and non-reimbursed allowable expenses. (Report calculating the University cost burdens verses reimbursement benefits) Effort reporting process reevaluated given enhancements in technology. Revisit inventory regulations Create a national best practices showroom: policies, practices, systems with the concept of "cradle to grave" management of federal research projects.
D.9d,D.5c		To effectively address the issue faced by universities involved in collaborative relationships with VA's, it would be useful to invite the Department of Veteran Affairs to be an FDP member along with representation from the VA Non Profit Research Foundations. It would then be useful to put together an overall listing of all VA/University relationships around the country along with details about each relationships particular setup and issues. Informal assessment of these relationships around the country has indicated similar circumstances and issues. A pilot project with the VA could include performance of an analysis/survey of the VA space costs and whether they adequately reimburse the VA for conduct of federal research within the VA. Analysis and discussion about these issues could result in clearer guidance provided to universities managing VA faculty federal grants and provide for more effective management of these projects. Universities are required to have an A-133 audit performed annually to ensure proper management of federal research dollars. Universities contract with accounting firms to conduct these audits. The federal government is placing more and more emphasis on these audits to perform tests and ensure that compliance requirements are being met. There is also a trend towards reduction of up front certifications or information provided, based on the fact that areas can instead be reviewed though the A-133 on an annual basis. The challenge however is that the audit community is not well educated and up to date on the specific requirements of grants management. It is common for university staff to be required to educate their auditors during the conduct of the annual A-133 audit. As the federal government relies more and more on the conduct of these audits for compliance assurance it is imperative that the audit community stay actively involved and educated on the rapidly changing regulations and compliance requirements. In addition, this community could play a valuable role in establishing best practices for universities grants management programs. The nation's audit community should be actively involved in efforts such as FDP in order for them to stay current on on-going requirements. If the federal government is going to rely on these audits to ensure compliance with regulations, efforts to ensure the proper education of the audit community would enable more reliance on these audits and ability to reduce up front administrative burden. In addition, recent national events involving the audit community seem to call for a close look at the relationship between the federal government, universities and that audit community. Involving this community closer with FDP would provide an organized mechanism for such efforts.
D.5.d, D.5.e	Purdue University	Most universities have some type of a P-card program now in place for purchasing items of small dollar amounts but high volume. In most cases, the business offices initiate these transactions with all supporting documentation for that transaction residing in the department. We recommend that FDP IV develop a list of "best practices" that takes into account the high volume but relatively low transactional amounts. Topics that should be covered in the "best practices" include type of supporting documentation that should be maintained, reconciliation procedures, and any differences to those requirements based on the transaction amount. Universities that are currently keeping large amounts of supporting documentation for each transaction could benefit from some relief on small dollar transactions while other Universities in the process of establishing guidelines would have a resource available. Federal agency representatives would benefit from a better understanding of the processes and help by assessing the risks of not maintaining documentation or reconciling small dollar transactions. Another problem that is occurring as a result of the increased use of p-cards is in the cash management requirements as defined in OMB Circular A-110. Most universities are booking p-card transactions to their general ledger as the daily/weekly transaction reports are received from the bank. However, the p-card bill is usually paid no more frequently than once a month. In these cases, expenses are booking to the GL prior to the actual cash outlay, which

		could impact how Universities draw cash for letter of credit accounts and track cash balances in order to refund to the Federal Government interest earned on the cash balances. We recommend that FDP IV do a careful analysis of the timing issues with p-card transactions relative to the cash management requirements in OMB Circular A-110 and develop guidelines. Universities and Federal Agencies would all benefit from this project through a common understanding of the problem and agreement on how it should be managed. NASA, NSF, NIH, and Department of Education all have training grant or fellowship programs limiting the amount that can be charged for the recipient's tuition and fees. These limits cause lost revenue in the form of tuition recovery for the University and creates additional costs to manage and maintain systems and processes capable of charging partial tuition to a source of funds with the remainder either charged to another source or waived by the University. We recommend that FDP IV form a working group to identify the Federal Agency's concerns and reasons for the caps, identify the burdens this places on Universities and to develop recommendations that address the concerns of both the Federal Agencies and Universities.
D.2,D.5	Northeastern University	Project to evaluate the adminstrative burden of F&A proposal process, addressing areas of specific concern such as space usage issues and non-reimbursed allowable expenses. (Report calculating the University cost burdens verses reimbursement benefits) Effort reporting process reevaluated given enhancements in technology. Revisit inventory regulations Create a national best practices showroom: policies, practices, systems with the concept of "cradle to grave" management of federal research projects.
D.2,D.9.e	University of Minnesota	Cost Sharing and Effort Certification. We are going to build a web-based effort system with links to our EGMS proposal and award system, and with our PeopleSoft payroll system, and would like to contribute to the discussions and solutions to a better method of gathering this information and reporting it to our sponsors, to insure that institutions and our sponsors can get meaningful data while minimizing the burden on PIs and administrators **Sharing Knowledge with Minority Institutions** . We have existing programs with HBCU institutions and their offices of sponsored programs. We would like to work with those institutions, and with others, to share knowledge and resources to help them develop efficiencies and redesign processes in sponsored programs management. The FDP is an excellent venue for this.
D.5	University of Rochester	**Burden of NIH Salary Cap**: The NIH salary cap has created a significant administrative burden on NIH funded institutions. Schools are faced with accounting for multiple caps, and ensuring that salary dollars over the cap are diverted to appropriate institutional accounts. Our first recommendation for eliminating this burden, and for providing a greater incentive for clinical researchers, is to eliminate the cap. Given that this is probably not a viable solution, we propose that the cap remain a funding, but not an expense, restriction. In this way, the burden of absolute accounting is eliminated, and the institution can decide for itself whether to charge the full salary or rebudget accordingly. This already holds true with graduate student expenses on NIH awards. Simultaneously, we would recommend that if the institution chooses to charge the capped amount of salary, that the portion over the cap not be considered mandatory or voluntary cost sharing for the purposes of reporting, as that would be counterproductive to this pilot. Ways to assess this impact would include an assessment by institutions of the time currently spent in accounting procedures dedicated to the NIH cap. Expected benefits include far less administrative burden, and possibly a greater incentive for clinical faculty to participate in NIH research. **Streamlining and Improving the A-133 Audit Process:** Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 is under continuous scrutiny by federal agencies and the OMB regarding its effectiveness. Many universities are also critical of the process. Our recommendation for a pilot is to grant certain qualifying institutions an exemption from the requirement of an independent, external audit of federal programs. An institution satisfying the Low-Risk Auditee criteria, with properly qualified internal audit staff, could perform the annual Single Audit procedures and self-certify as to the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards. The independent audit firm would provide a GAAP-only audit opinion on the institution's financial statements, with an agreed-upon procedures letter communicating the firm's comfort that program coverage requirements are satisfied, the internal auditor is in compliance with Yellow Book training standards, and that no reportable conditions,

		material weaknesses or material instances of noncompliance were identified through the independent auditor's current year financial statement audit. Perhaps every third year the Single Audit would need to be performed by the external, independent auditor. The expected benefits include time and cost savings for re-investment into the ongoing sponsored program administrative efforts (training, systems, and oversight) and a product with improved reliability. Measurements of success would include the nature of Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs comments and reduction in audit fees, which could be obtained through a poll of a sample of institutions
D.9.f	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	A significant problem for many institutions is timely and efficient processing and management of grants and contracts received from state and local government agencies. Their denial or limitation of F&A recovery in some situations is an issue familiar to many institutions, and often agencies will try to impose their own limitations or restrictions that impose additional burdens. There also are inconsistencies in practice between agencies (and sometimes within the same agency) in proposal development, contracting, and financial reporting. The agencies, on the other hand, may view universities as pompous, picky, unreasonable, and as organizations requiring close regulatory scrutiny. There are a variety of factors contributing to this climate, and many are tied to state legalities, organizational culture, and political climate. However, much of the funding received from these agencies is federal pass-through, and the differences in the ways agencies and universities interpret the federal regulations may explain much of the problem. Too, at times there seems to be a mutual lack of understanding of one another's regulatory and operating environment. Coming together to clarify the rules and misunderstandings will be the key to the solution of the problem.
D.6,D.4	The University of Texas at Arlington	Uniform terms and conditions, even if they are agency specific this would help the smaller research institutions such as UTA enormously. We are encouraged by the subcontract development undertaken by FDP and are using the prototype in issuing subcontracts to other universities. The impact in this area can be assessed by monitoring the time it takes to issue a subcontract to a university who has not approved the use of the prototype FDP subcontract v. those that are using it. A simple assessment of the number of transactions will also apply to this evaluation.
D.5g	UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI	Increase the Administrative Overhead Recovery Cap Most research institutions are reporting that their costs for administrative overhead far exceed the 26% mandated cap by 0MB A-2l. At the very least, institutions need to recapture the cost of compliance in the areas of administrative oversight, animal welfare and human subjects. In order to provide effective stewardship of research, institutions currently demand more work from faculty and staff and/or supplement the cost of doing research with limited institutional funds. If research is to continue for the public good, then the government should pay its fair share and not continue to impose burdens over institutional budgets that are already stressed. In addition, the government currently pays full indirect cost plus a profit margin to private companies, but it is not willing to pay the full cost of overhead for not-for-profit institutions. Institutions should receive full overhead from federal agencies for all types of research (grants or contracts) and the cap should be lifted to cover the actual cost of doing business. FDP can work with the federal agencies to ensure these issues are addressed with the need that F &A covers the full cost of all overhead.
D.5	Texas A&M ResearchFoundation	Standardize Letter of Credit Drawdowns and reporting using the NSF model. Evaluate time savings by documenting current time vs using standard model
D.7,D.6		OMB to implement PL 106-107. Meeting multiple agency requirements at both the proposal stage and the award monitoring stage increase the time involvement of both the scientists and the University administration. At a time when research dollars are at a premium and everyone is in a time crunch, this depletes our resources for quality research. More federal agencies involved in FDP demonstrations where the federal agency accepts the FDP terms and conditions, that is, USDA agencies other than CSREES, could apply the CSREES terms and conditions to the administration of their grants.
D.5.b	Texas A& M University	Standardize The Automated Standard Application for Payments System The Automated Standard Application for Payments System (ASAP) is one of

		several systems used to request/draw Federal funds. The Treasury is requiring all Federal agencies to convert to either ASAP or the Payment Management System (PMS) in the near future. NSF and DOE are currently in the process of switching to the ASAP system. Problem: The ASAP system is not a web-based system instead it must be accessed by either a phone modem connection or by voice response (dialing up the system using a touchtone phone). These two access methods are archaic, cumbersome and outdated when compared to the web based Payment Management System. Suggestion: Convert ASAP to a web-based system. Benefits: More user-friendly system. Take advantage of current technology.
D.5b	Texas Tech University	Reducing the number of payment systems,
D.5	Tulane University	Our proposed pilot project to Tulane University administration would be to require that ORA and G&C continue to review personnel charges, equipment (items $2500 and over), consultant payments, travel and subcontracts in advance of the expenditure. Items such as books/subscriptions, FedEx, postage, Vivarium charges, shared instrumentation facility charges, etc. will no longer be subjected to a pre-audit by ORA and G&C. These will be reviewed periodically and at the close of the grant/contract period in preparation for financial report submission. We propose that initially 10 departments be identified to participate in the pilot study. ORA and G&C will be granted authority to transfer erroneous or unallowable costs onto unrestricted accounts identified by the participating departments. After 6 months and again at 12 months, an analysis will be conducted on expenses charged to sponsored accounts to assess the extent to which any unallowable costs have been processed by the departments. In the event such expenditures are found, costs will be transferred off the grant and on to departmental accounts. Findings will be reported to senior administration. There are many expected benefits to the changes we propose. Our faculty will have less red tape and more time to spend on their projects; expenses will be recorded in the accounting system faster, giving the PI and departmental administrators better and more up to date information on sponsored accounts; the faster expenses move through the accounting system, the faster we can invoice our sponsors. ORA and G&C staff will have more opportunities to be proactive with investigators and administrators about their accounts instead of being surprised and having to react to a project/account in crisis.
D.2,D.	University of Arizona	Simplified documentation requirements for employee effort. Proposed Project: Eliminate project financial status reporting (SF269) Approach: - FDP calls for an FDP agency volunteer and invites all FDP institutions to participate in the pilot - Volunteer agency identifies the data it reviews from the SF269 financial report and identifies the purpose of the review - Volunteer agency locates another source of the information currently available, i.e., FCTR, final technical report - Sponsor eliminates requirement for SF269 for pilot institutions - Pilot institutions stop submitting SF269's to volunteer agency and participate in the assessment of the impact Assessment of the Impact: - Measure the volunteer agency's cost of gathering the information from other sources - Measure the volunteer agency's cost savings of not maintaining the SF269 database - Measure the institutions' cost savings of not preparing the SF269 - Measure the increased risk, if any, of eliminating the SF269 Expected benefits: - Cost savings with no loss in accountability
D.2,D5	University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Cost Sharing and Time & Effort Reporting: Currently cost sharing and time & effort reporting is done manually. As UALR completes BANNER implementation, the next modules to come on line will be those related to personnel actions. These will feed an electronic time & effort reporting system and cost sharing reports. This reporting will result in a significant time savings.

		Drawdowns of Federal Funds: Each federal agency has differing requirements for drawdowns, password security, and related activities. A consistent and efficient method for these transactions is an important need as it will save institutions time in training staff and increase efficiency.
D.6,D.4, D.9.f	University of California-Systemwide	A. Expand FDP membership of federal agencies to include other agencies such as Education, NOAA, and Interior which fund research and are currently not FDP members. However, the timing for this activity coincides with this open membership application period. B. Revisit agency-specific terms and condition issues which were not resolved under Phase III, as well as outstanding issues with OMB Circular A-110. The FDP Terms and Conditions has identified some items which need to be addressed by agencies and OMB. To date, they have not been resolved to the satisfaction of both grantees and agencies. C. Address the continuing expansion of agency deviations from the FDP Standard Terms and Conditions. Procedures for adding any new terms and conditions must be followed. New terms must be presented to the full body for consideration with a negotiated discussion required either with the Terms and Conditions Task Force or an ad-hoc group of interested representatives before a new term is finalized. D. In the last revision of FDP terms and conditions, most agencies dropped FDP coverage for cooperative agreements. It is worthwhile to reopen this issue for an agency-byagency consideration of whether or not FDP terms can cover cooperative agreements and review inclusion of cooperative agreements in FDP terms as they were before the last revision to the FDP terms and conditions. E. Create a version of the FDP Subaward Model which can be used by or for all federal grantees subject to OMB Circular A-122 (non-profit organizations) as well as the current version which applies to higher education grantees. Address the cost to grantees in the growth of federal regulatory requirements: Many studies have been conducted on the cost of the increasing federal regulatory burden. A new FDP Task Force could review these studies and determine if an FDP pilot demonstration which would reduce any of these new costly administrative burdens could be developed. This project should also address the direct costing selecting unfunded federal requirements.
D.6,D.4	University of California- Los Angeles	We suggest that FDP consider expansion of the FDP terms and conditions to include contracts, cooperative agreements, and program project/center-type awards. Or, at a minimum, a review of the reasons that cooperative agreements were deleted by most participating agencies in the last revision of FDP terms and conditions with consideration of having coverage of cooperative agreements re-instated. Phase IV may provide an opportunity to revisit the concept of a master Institutional Funding Agreement (IFA) especially applicable to the representations and certifications required by federal agencies. As outlined in an NIH concept paper discussed at the Fall 2000 FDP session, adoption of an IFA would reflect an institutional, rather than grant-by-grant, approach to oversight. As an IFA could possibly be cross-agency, a feasibility evaluation might be initially done within a working group prior to expansion to a pilot or demonstration project. At the January 2002 meeting, it was suggested that FDP approach the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to review the language and templates used in the FDP Subaward Model as a basis for agency standardization. We suggest, as well, that a subaward model be developed for use with grantees subject to OMB Circular A-122. Perhaps, through a demonstration, all FDP federal agencies (with OMB support) would accept the FDP Subaward Model.
D.10,D.6	University of Chicago	FDP III was a major player in the PRD IV assessment of the university-government partnership. The final PRD Report articulated principles of the partnership and offered a set of thoughtful recommendations. FDP IV should be committed to having the current administration affirm the final Report especially the core apolitical principles of a valued partnership. FDP IV should continue to examine and call attention to the principles and recommendations

		contained in the PRD report. FDPIV offers demonstration opportunities for nuts and bolts research administration examinations such as streamlining of terms and conditions for grants, cooperative agreements and contracts. Initiatives for such demonstrations should be encouraged. It is particularly important that agency representatives use FDP as the "go-to" organization for streamlining and productivity assessments and demonstrations. Modest demonstrations might include: 1. Uniformity within Armys to waive the requirement for prior approval of no-cost extension - some units require, others do not. (2) DOD agenices are the only FDP grant sponsors that require agency approval for title to supplies with value of more than $5,000 at the end of the project. (little nits, we agree, but time consuming nits, and worth eliminating through a modest demo if possible. There are probably other small wins in a sea of expanding regulations.) OMB is a key player in the government-university partnership. FDP IV should explore ways to formalize OMB's role in FDP. A sustained and visible OMB involvement ("membership") in the FDP would have considerable benefit for all. For example, OMB could recognize FDPIV as a forum to facilitate the administration's understanding of the value of the federal research investment.
D.2, D.1,D.5	University of Cincinnati	University of Cincinnati was one of the eleven schools that attempted the Effort Reporting/Cost Sharing demonstration. We would like to see that demonstration revived and allowed to go forward in some fashion. One option would be to again request representatives from OMB and DHHS Division of Cost Allocation to meet with the previous eleven schools to obtain a better understanding of their fears and ask them suggestions on a limited demonstration. Another option would be to get the Program Directors from NIH, NSF, DOD and other agencies to attend an FDP meeting to discuss with faculty the value of effort percentage estimates at the proposal stage. FDP schools could prepare a survey of faculty estimated effort at the proposal stage vs. actual effort expended at the close of the award along with the reimbursed effort. I believe this data will clearly show more effort is expended on 90-95% of the awards than is reimbursed by the government further building our case. The January 5, 2001 memo from OMB clarifying voluntary cost sharing should provide faculty and institutions with some protection based upon the findings. OMB representatives made it clear they would revisit this position in three years to determine if F&A rates increased. The FDP should establish a task force to accumulate faculty effort data discussed above and develop other criteria to initiate discussions with OMB on the evaluation criteria. We should not wait for OMB to develop the evaluation criteria before asking for our input. **Budgeting** Since only 30-40% of proposals are funding, a demonstration were budgets are sent in the “justin- time” framework as with animal and human protocols could save significant effort for faculty and administrators on the 60-70 of proposals that will never be funded. Since many of its awards are at the $100,000 level, NSF could be chosen as the agency so faculty, institutions and reviewers would have a general idea of the size. Faculty and university reviewers could spend more time on the science and less on administration, which is the true mission of the FDP.
D.7,D.5	University of Illinois, Chicago	A potential pilot project for the FDP in Phase IV is to tackle the remaining administrative hurdles in response to Public Law 106- 107, particularly post-award financial management and accounting systems. The FDP 106- 107 Task Force could use their collective expertise and resources to develop and pilot test a web-based financial system that could integrate the agencies’ and universities’ financial accounting systems. Since financial reporting systems are agency-specific, universities are unable to interface with them at this time. Greater consistencies among the funding agencies financial accounting systems will further enhance the streamlining and stewardship of Federal Awards administration. In Phase IV, a task force dedicated to streamlining methods of auditing of Federally funded protocols should be established. A dialogue between universities and government can evaluate the benefits of a universally acceptable system to auditing research funding and applying the Federal

		Audit Clearing house rules, regulations and guidelines. Once the system is developed, a pilot test should be undertaken by the FDP members to evaluate the processes of this system and its impact on the administration of research auditing.
D.7. D.2,D.5	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	Work with the 106-107 Post-award Working Group of the Grants Management Committee of the Chief Financial Officers to pilot a web-based financial reporting system that can be readily fed by university financial accounting systems and readily accepted by agency financial accounting systems. Financial reporting systems are currently agency-specific and universities cannot undertake the programming necessary to interface their financial systems with each agency's financial reporting system. Work with a new task force to develop minimal acceptable criteria for documenting direct effort charged to sponsored projects, contributed effort, and other forms of cost sharing. Develop a procedure whereby institutions can use the Single Audit Clearinghouse to satisfy the requirement that their subrecipients have satisfied the A-133 audit requirements, rather than requiring the extensive swapping of audit certifications.
D.2	University of Maryland, College Park	Effort Reporting The FDP should still pursue an effort reporting demonstration.
D.2	University of Hawaii	Burden of Effort Certifications: - Study new approach being implemented at Dartmouth and review Federal and audit community; acceptance. Need to assess any negative compliance impact. - Relieves PI of arduous task of certifying multiple documents on a monthly basis
D. 5	Florida Atlantic University	Payment and Reporting Management System – get all federal agencies to accept a consistent method.