



The National Academies of
SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

January 8-10, 2020
Marriott Wardman Park
2660 Woodley Rd NW
Washington, DC 20008

Quick meeting summary

The FDP met from Wednesday, January 8, 2020 through Friday, January 10, 2020 at the Marriott Wardman Park. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slide presentations and other relevant materials. This meeting summary is not intended to replace the larger meetings notes documents, but rather is meant to serve as a reminder of what was covered in each session, with links to the meeting materials.

Thursday, January 9, 2020

8:30 a.m. – **Welcome, News & Updates** - Dick Seligman, FDP Co-Chair, kicked off the meeting with an announcement that the Marriott Wardman Park will be the location of the next few FDP meetings, while also calling everyone's attention to the JCORE (Joint Committee on the Research Environment) Update session. Michele Masucci, also FDP Co-Chair, invited anyone interested in the Faculty Workload Survey to attend the faculty lunch and interactive concurrent sessions devoted to that initiative and to share their feedback on the outcomes. FDP Executive Director David Wright then provided updates on the transition to Phase VII. Items of interest included (1) the change in FDP's fiscal year to correspond to the calendar year, (2) the elimination of "system" memberships for institutions with branch campuses (in Phase VII there will only be one membership per EIN), and (3) the new dues structure which will be tiered based on each institution's 2018 NSF HERD survey research expenditures.

[Phase VII Transition Update](#)

9:00 a.m. – **Plenary – Federal Agency Updates**
10:15 a.m. Agency representatives from the National Science Foundation, Office of Naval Research, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, National Institutes of Health, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Department of Homeland Security, and Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable presented on news, updates, and changes within their respective agencies. A compilation of summaries of each agency update can be found [here](#).

[NSF Update](#)
[ONR Update](#)
EPA (no slides)
[AFOSR Update](#)
[NIH Update](#)
[NASA Update](#)
[DHS Update](#)
[GUIRR Update](#)

10:30 a.m.– **Plenary – OSTP JCORE Update**
11:45 p.m. The Joint Committee on the Research Environment (JCORE) is responsible for addressing key areas that impact the US research enterprise. This session provided an overview of those key areas: 1. Harassment and Discrimination: providing a safe and inclusive research environment, 2. Research Security: openness, collaboration and transparency allow the US to have a successful research environment, 3. Reducing Administrative Burden: improving application requirements (digital identifiers) and revise conflict of interest rules, 4. Rigor and Reproducibility: increase transparency and reporting of all results, incentive structures and their effects on reports.

(slides not available)

11:45 a.m.–
1:00 p.m.

Faculty Lunch Forum -
Summary not available.

(no slides)

1:00 p.m. –
2:15 p.m.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 1

Foreign Influence Management - Advancing Understanding while Reducing Burden in this evolving environment

[Presentation](#)

Pam Webb (Minnesota) and Jim Luther (Duke) opened the session with a brief overview of the main concerns relating to foreign influence and an update on what has changed since the last FDP meeting in September. Then a panel consisting of Bindu Nair (DoD), Jean Feldman (NSF), and Michele Bulls (NIH) provided an agency perspective on the changing landscape of foreign influence compliance, focusing on impact of events in the last quarter to manage the economic impact of foreign influence while also protecting the value of international collaboration. The DOD emphasized that they lack the authority to conduct security checks on researchers without congressional action, hence the need for institutional risk assessment instead of reliance on lists (“behavior-based” not necessarily “country-of-origin-based” foreign influence concerns). NSF’s content focused on the need for institutions to establish a “know your collaborator” culture in U.S. research and to develop university level cybersecurity infrastructure to combat misappropriation of research data. Recommendations included educating researchers to understand and recognize problematic contract terms (e.g. “talent programs” that require investigators to (1) abide by laws of foreign country; (2) perform work remotely; (3) regularly recruit post docs; and (4) not disclose existence of contract without permission) and expanding the concept of research integrity to include full disclosure of actual and potential conflict of interest and commitment. NIH closed out the discussion by citing current efforts by NIH and NSF to harmonize their compliance requirements while also recognizing NIH’s unique position as part of HHS, which has regulatory requirements that don’t apply to other agencies.

Useful Links: [OSTP Dear Colleague Letter](#); [OSTP RFI](#); [The Complete JASON Report](#)

Faculty – Rigor and Reproducibility

(slides not available)

Lisa Nichols (Office of Science and Technology Policy) opened the session with a brief overview of the JCORE subcommittee’s work thus far on how rigor and reproducibility are being envisioned by OSTP. The subcommittee is currently evaluating what cultural factors reduce rigor and reproducibility (e.g., misconduct, lack of transparency, academic incentive structure), and want to gather feedback from the community to help inform subcommittee conversations on this topic. The floor was then opened for comment. The majority of the discussion centered around data management plans (is there more value in asking for this at JIT?) and data sharing (possible to standardize metadata?). Faculty encouraged JCORE to think broadly in terms of field of study, as different disciplines have different paradigms around data use and definitions of what “reproducible” means (e.g., biological sciences vs. earth sciences or social sciences). Faculty also suggested that journals could be leveraged as a “gate keeper” for quality.

Open Government: Research Administration Data (OGRAD) Subcommittee – Letter of Credit Update

[Presentation](#)

This session provided an update on the status of OGRAD activities and initiatives. The Letter of Credit (LOC) Workload Burden survey has been developed to quantify the workload of using multiple LOCs through five government pay systems. The subcommittee received 61 one responses ranging from large institutions, small institutions and public and private institutions. The survey requested data on frequency of drawing funds from each system, ease of use and understanding of award data and staff that utilize the systems.

The next steps of this effort are to complete the full analysis of the data in Spring of 2020. The data collected in this survey is a strategic asset for reducing the workload and supports the push for a single federal draw system.

Emerging Research Institutions (ERI) – National Academies Study on Minority Serving Institutions (MSI)

(slides not available)

This session included a discussion of the National Academies study on MSIs and strengthening STEM workforce as well as increasing collaboration and competitiveness. The FDP executive committee approved ERI as a new programmatic committee, a change from its current placement within the membership committee. The speakers touched on the various MSI categories and announce several upcoming town halls in California and other locations. The reports discussed were funded from private foundation sources and the study spanned 18 months. The group reviewed policies at MSIs that improved and strengthened the minority STEM workforce and how other institutions may implement more effective policies. Intentionality is key, the NAS argues, to better engage students.

The five discussion topics included best arguments for supporting increased government investment in MSIs, how MSIs strengthen their faculty and laboratory resources with limited funding, how MSIs can more effectively recruit and retain star faculty, how MSI can more effectively market themselves to students, and what costs does the U.S. suffer if MSIs are not sustained or expanded.

Useful Link: More information regarding the NAS reports discussed can be downloaded [here](#) and [here](#).

2:20 p.m. –
3:35 p.m.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 2

Subawards & IACUC – Animal Subjects MOU

[Presentation](#)

The goal of this joint initiative by the FDP IACUC and Subawards Subcommittees is to evaluate opportunities to streamline agreements between collaborating institutions using vertebrate animals per the expectations of the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*, 8th Edition (*Guide*). This session, hosted by Stephanie Scott (Columbia), Amanda Humphrey (Northwestern), and Axel Wolff (NIH/OLAW), opened with a brief summary of the work completed to date, which includes initial conversations to frame the administrative burden around this topic and gathering information on current practices. The subcommittees also jointly hosted a webinar in October with the goal of having good representation from both IACUC and grants administrators. The webinar was very well attended. Polling questions asked during the webinar revealed that this is an area with variable perspective, practice and understanding. Given the complexity of the issue, simply adding language to the subaward template may not be the best solution as an initial first step. Attendees agreed to start with creating guidance, and then explore an appropriate agreement type.

Next steps: Co-chairs will be reaching out to volunteers to set up regular meetings. The working group will focus initially on developing guidance documents for institutions on the expectations and need for such agreements (such as MOUs). The goal will be to have this first deliverable by the September meeting.

eRA – Grants.gov Transformation

[Presentation](#)

Grants.gov staff were on hand to provide an update on the Grants.gov transformation progress. [Beta.grants.gov](#) is available 24/7 for anyone to test it and give continual feedback – they request that as many users do this as possible to provide the widest range of feedback. New features come online frequently (slide shows timeline/functionalities available).

Next Steps: February 2020 is the next external evaluation – your participation is crucial! July 2020 external evaluation will be testing period for the system-to-system functionality. After the update provided, staff did break-out sessions to get feedback on the page designs.

Faculty Workload Survey

(slides not available)

This session began with a review of the results of the Faculty Workload Survey. In this session, attendees discussed the major findings of the grant administration workload on faculty. The survey results revealed that faculty felt more burdened when they were working with more agencies, preparing more proposals, submitting training, teaching or community service proposals, and at institutions with lower levels of funding.

Faculty that are involved in more research activity than teaching and services, feel less of a burden. To this end, faculty at institutions with lower overall burden feel the institutions trust and involve faculty with research activity.

The survey also revealed possible next steps for lowering the administration workload on faculty. These include administration changes in the following areas of Pre-Award: animal care, human subjects, and budget and budget justification preparation. These also include administration changes in the following areas of Post-Award: clinical trial management, animal care and human subjects and subcontract management.

Open Government: Research Administration Data (OGRAD) Subcommittee – Distributed Ledger Technology

(slides not available)

Mike Wetklow (NSF), Craig Fischer and Jennifer Hill (Treasury), Kyle Burgess (Deloitte) described their four-month pilot to learn/explore the possibilities of distributed ledger technology (“Blockchain”) to improve Letter of Credit (LOC) grant payment processes. Primary idea is how dollars can be “tokenized” (think Chuck ‘E’ Cheese or State Fair tickets!) to result in a single LOC on platform visible by federal agency, prime awardee and approved subrecipients, based on the terms and conditions set in the “smart contract”, such as Period of performance, funding levels, etc. FDP audience members agreed that concept merits further exploration, dissemination and demonstration.

Conflict of Interest Subcommittee

[Presentation](#)

Mary Lee from Stanford University led the presentation. Arising from discussions at the November COGR meeting, there will be a Conflict of Commitment working group established within FDP. In addition, there is now a Foreign Influence work group which is a cross-committee group chaired by Pam Webb and Jim Luther. Regarding the JCORE RFI, institutions were strongly encouraged to submit comments (the page has over 10,000 views, but only 60 responses). Then there was discussion about the issue of connecting the dots on information and data relating to foreign influence, and the fact data on foreign involvements and outside appointments are typically held in one office, while reporting duties are located in sponsored projects or other central offices. Items for further consideration on this topic included how can we best link the information needed so that all parties with reporting responsibilities are informed; should institutions reconsider their current disclosure processes (e.g. paper vs. electronic); who has authority to review disclosures; and which office has responsibility for managing Conflict of Commitment review?

Next steps: Institutions should send ideas on what they would like to see the COI Committee focus on in the future, and/or any best practices that they would like to share, to Mary Lee at Stanford (marylee@stanford.edu). Also, anyone not already subscribed to the COI Committee listserv can do so on the [FDP Mailing Lists webpage](#).

3:50 p.m. –
5:05 p.m.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 3

[Presentation](#)

Subawards Subcommittee

The session primarily focused on sharing and discussing highlights of current activities. The 2019 templates were finalized in September with draft FAQs to be released soon. An FDP Data Transfer and Use Agreement (DTUA) attachment (Attachment 7) to be included in subawards is now available for use (not required, being piloted). More guidance will be available for this new attachment and pilot. Participants engaged in a discussion regarding various institutional processes for this new attachment. A status recap regarding Certificates of Confidentiality (CoC) and the language added to the templates was provided. Attendees were reminded that while other federal agencies have issued their own guidance regarding obtaining CoCs, the current boilerplate language is only applicable to NIH. It is the responsibility of the PTE to flow-down language from other sponsors in subawards. Asking membership to consider how to move forward as the templates could be modified if necessary. Attendees were updated on the pending question related to sIRB and whether or not existing subawards would need to be modified. An update was issued November 21, 2019 from OHRP, clarifying the exceptions to the Single IRB Policy. The compliance date of 45 CFR 46.114(b) of the 2018 Requirements is **January 20, 2020**. See [the full text of the provision](#) for a more detailed explanation. If a project is not transitioning to Single IRB then a subaward amendment indicating the project is now under a single IRB is not necessary. Institutions should consult within their own offices about project-specific situations. Kathy Kreidler shared preliminary results from the 92 responses to the Subaward Delay Survey that was sent out in November 2019.

A discussion was led focused on the structure and the future leadership of the Subawards Subcommittee. The focus is on ensuring continuity. One possibility is the creation of a steering committee with the Workgroup Leads, Members at Large, and federal agency representatives. Attendees voiced their desire to maintain the dynamic of the subcommittee, leadership, protection of the templates and what has been created.

Next Steps: Volunteers requested to assist with the subcontract sample guidance document. Further discussion of the full results from the Subaward Delay Survey results and recommended best practices will be prepared for the May meeting. Continue discussing the future subcommittee structure and

eRA - SciENcv and ORCID Best Practices for Implementation

Representatives from SciENcv, ORCID, NIH, and NSF began the session with a discussion of the rationale behind ORCID and SciENcv (for example, SciENcv-generated CV with xml components will allow federal agency to extract data elements, not currently possible with word-processed PDF) and a summary of current and future planned capabilities. As in the morning plenary session, NSF also reaffirmed that institutions will receive 90 days' notice before the requirement for using SciENcv for biosketch generation goes into effect. Highlights on current functionality in these two systems included: for SciENcv, bulk citation uploading, creating and storing multiple biosketch versions, delegate account access, and a variety of videos and training materials; and for ORCID, the ability to import from End Note, "wizard" capability that can assist to search and pull faculty publications into profile, and a section of the ORCID website addressing how to consolidate duplicate accounts. Staff from NC State University and the University of Notre Dame then presented on their efforts to assist researchers transitioning to using these systems at their institutions, including training, publication importing services, and the benefits of having an institutional account in ORCID. They also addressed the challenges involved and identified some of the most commonly reported problems.

[ORCID Slides](#)
[NIH Slides](#)
[NSF Slides](#)
[NC State Slides](#)

Useful Link: To get an idea of the level of assistance being provided at NC State, see their website on "[Using SciENcv to Create Your Biosketch.](#)"

Finance/Costing/Audit Committee

This committee has focused on reasonable costing related to administrative burden for faculty and administrators, including topics around Uniform Guidance Procurement, the costing aspects of Rigor and Reproducibility and Research Integrity, and a Letter of Credit (LOC) survey with the Research Administration Committee. Discussion of possible future topics included the costing aspects of Public Access/data storage and curation; the ongoing cross-cutting work with the Foreign Influence Working Group, including the cost burden of changing current and pending; analysis of the Faculty Workload Survey to overlay costing data to the identified burdens; cost of reconciliation/refunds/closeout (whole dollars vs. cents); guidance on handling of rebates; payment/draw timing "reasonableness" and the compliance supplement wording congruency (audit community's understanding); and publication costs that can be incurred through closeout.

[Presentation](#)

Next Steps: Volunteers who want to take the lead on any of the identified areas, address specific things (or share additional ideas on relevant topics) are welcome. If you are interested in participating in future work, ensure you are on the listserv (FDP-Costing-Finance-L). Focus areas and additional volunteer calls will be distributed via this mailing list. Anyone interested in assisting with the analysis of the LOC survey Letter of Credit should reach out to Nate Martinez-Wayman (nate.matinez-wayman@duke.edu).

ReInvent Grants Management and the Grant-Recipient Digital Dossier – Analyzing 500 Billion in Grant Funding to Assess Pre-Award Risk

(slides not available)

This session focused on introducing attendees to emerging technology that is contributing to the grants management experience. The US department of Health and Human Services has developed a tool called the Grant-Recipient Digital Dossier (GDD). GDD is a distributed ledger technology that ties all grants management processes together as a single-user interface that provides performance measurements and improvements to grant administration.

This tool allows users to understand their institutional risks from a funder's perspective and helps users determine steps to mitigate those perceived risks. GDD gives users a sense of general, operational and financial compliance by incorporating recent audit results and findings from the federal audit clearinghouse. Primary award recipients are also able to assess risks associated with potential subcontractors and subaward recipients.

Attendees in this session participated in a user-centered design session and provided useful feedback on the technology and its capabilities.

Animal Subjects Subcommittee– Universal Protocol Form & CUSP

[IACUC Slides](#)
[CUSP Slides](#)

This session centered on two burden reducing initiatives from the 21 st Century Cures Act – the Compliance Unit Standard Procedure (CUSP) Sharing Site and the Universal Protocol Template (UPT). Aubrey Schoenleben (University of Washington) provided a brief update on the CUSP project. The goal is to develop an online venue where participating institutions can share standard procedures used in animal research protocols. This working group is currently focused on site development and testing, with anticipated completion of the initial site construction and alpha testing in March 2020.

Bill Greer (University of Michigan) and Ron Banks (University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center) led the discussion on the UPT. The goal of this project is to develop a sample animal protocol form focused on required protocol elements to ensure animal welfare and assist in IACUC review, utilizing check boxes or pre-formulated responses where possible to reduce the effort required to put together

a high-quality protocol. A draft of the UPT has been developed. Next steps will include: (1) breaking the draft form in to sections and evaluating each question; (2) evaluation by regulatory agencies, researchers and IACUCs; (3) final document testing by researchers, IACUCs, veterinarians, and compliance staff. The working group is aiming to complete these steps by the end of the year.

Next steps: The CUSP working group is currently implementing a new working group structure to help prepare for and support roll out of the site to the larger community later this year. The working group will have four teams: Education & Outreach, Help Desk, Quality Control, and Technical Systems. If you are interested in volunteering, please email Aubrey Schoenleben (aubreys@uw.edu).

The UPT working group is looking for more volunteers to help evaluate the current draft and to participate in final document testing. If you are interested in volunteering, please email Bill Greer (wggreer@umich.edu).

Friday, January 10, 2020

8:00 a.m. – **Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 4**

8:55 a.m.

Faculty Business Meeting –
Summary not available.

(slides not available)

Data Stewardship Subcommittee

Melissa Korf and Martha Davis presented the preliminary results from the pilot of the FDP Data Transfer and Use Agreement (DTUA) template, which took place 11/1/18-10/31/19. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected to determine if templates reduce administrative burden. Preliminary results show that the use of the unmodified FDP templates saves time compared to use of non-FDP templates (avg. 46 days compared to 53 days, 13% less time). Participants appreciate the templates and refer other institutions to them when they don't already have their own template. A DTUA Attachment 7 for use in subawards is now available and is being piloted. More guidance will be available for this new attachment.

[Presentation](#)

Discussion occurred around the Draft NIH Policy for Data Management and Sharing and Supplemental Draft Guidance. The draft requires data management plans at JIT as opposed to the proposal stage, however, attendees felt that this was too late in the stage of the research project lifecycle. It was agreed that institutions should have all appropriate offices involved with tackling data sharing policies (IT, Libraries, Sponsored Projects, etc.). This subcommittee may explore working with NIH on system and repository requirements as a first step in trying to identify ways to reduce burden.

Next Steps: Analyze the DTUA pilot in further detail. Contact Melissa at Melissa_Korf@hms.harvard.edu and Martha at mrdavis@brandeis.edu if interested in helping to analyze and/or write white paper. Volunteers are also needed to develop a tool to collect the necessary information from PIs in order to prepare a DTUA.

eRA Committee – Agency Matrix

Members of the eRA Committee provided an overview and demonstration of the FDP Federal Agency Matrix and its transition from the previous Excel/Google Sheet versions to a new database format hosted on FDP's servers. The matrix is a database of federal online systems and portals, searchable by system or agency name, and committee members walked attendees through both search methods. Searching by system yields results detailing which agencies use the system, implementation date, what the system is used for, types of accounts (PI and/or AOR roles), system-to-system capabilities, and more. Searching by agency leads to agency entries that list which systems each agency uses and links to the

(slides not available)

agency and system websites. This demonstration was then followed by a discussion on the best ways to maintain the system and keep the data up to date. **Next Steps:** The eRA Committee is asking for volunteers to do beta testing and data validation in the new database before formally launching it. A sign-up sheet was passed around in the session, but anyone who didn't attend the session may email the eRA Committee co-chair [Mark Sweet](#) to express their interest in volunteering. The current Google Sheet version of the matrix can be found [here](#).

9:00 a.m. –
10:15 a.m.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 5

Foreign Influence Implementation Discussion

[Presentation](#)

The intent of this session was to get a sense of how different institutions are approaching the issue of foreign influence in research. The panel, consisting of Jim Luther (Duke), Pam Caudill (Yale), Michele Masucci (Temple), and Kim Moreland (Wisconsin), identified a list of primary areas of concern, and addressed each one by a brief introduction and informal “hand-raising” polls of the audience to gauge the level of concern and engagement on these issues among FDP member institutions. The issues discussed include institutional visitor policies; infrastructure and which offices and committees (existing or newly formed) are being tasked with managing foreign influence; whether institutions are adding new staff to address issues relating to foreign influence; what level of investment in new technology institutions are making (e.g. online disclosure systems); steps being taken specifically to address foreign talent recruitment programs; Other Support, the differences in what each agency expects to be included, and what institutions are actually seeing their PIs include on these lists; which federal requirements are most unclear or worrisome; and unintended consequences on academic freedom and burden resulting from the increased focus on foreign influence concerns.

Next Steps: Based on the responses to the poll questions, and the discussion relating to the areas of concern, Jim Luther indicated that the Foreign Influence Working Group was considering sending out a member survey on foreign influence, how institutions are responding to the new requirements, and the impacts of those requirements on the research environment.

Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT)

[Presentation](#)

This session was to discuss the transition into Phase 2 for FACT, which includes new leadership of Steve Post and Suzanne Alstadt from the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences. There was further discussion about how much time should be spent in defining where the FACT group falls within the overall FDP structure because of the group's makeup which is both faculty and administrators. The consensus of the group was to work toward more visibility within the FDP but not necessarily via the structure/organization chart. There were no other definitive decisions made, however many good comments were captured that the FACT will take into consideration as they transition into the next chapter.

Procurement – Discussion Group

[Presentation](#)

This session addressed concerns regarding procurement and the integrity of research. Procurement offices are responsible for maintaining records to detail the procurement history, selection of contract type, selection of contractor and basis of price and proper sourcing. Topics of discussion included: conflict of interest management, surplus property, time and material contracts, disputes and protests, geographic preference laws, sole source consulting agreements, informal bids and cost analysis.

Faculty Workload Survey

Summary not available.

(slides not available)

10:30 a.m.–
11:45 a.m.

Plenary – FDP Committee Reports

Members from each of the six programmatic committees (Faculty, eRA, Research Administration, Finance/Costing/Audit, Research Compliance, and Emerging Research Institutions) presented on recent accomplishments, ongoing initiatives, and plans for the future. While the four operational committees (Finance, Membership, Communication, and Infrastructure) did not present, a updates from the committees can be found [here](#).

[FDP Committee
Updates](#)

11:45 a.m.

FDP Meeting Adjourned