



Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its second virtual conference from Monday, September 21, 2020 through Friday, September 25, 2020. This document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and videos of the presentations. This meeting summary is intended to provide a high-level summary of the sessions and discussions. It is advised to watch the videos (when provided) and read the slides for full information.

**Monday,
September
21, 2020,
11:00am-
1:00pm
EDT**

Plenary - Dr. Sethuraman Panchanathan, Director, National Science Foundation – Please watch the Plenary by clicking the video button to the right.

[Video](#)

The FDP business meeting followed, which featured an orientation for new members, including an explanation of what the FDP is and a brief history of the organization, its redefined mission for Phase VII, and an official handoff of Administrative Co-Chair duties from Dick Seligman to Alex Albinak.

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

**Monday,
September
21, 2020,
1:30-4:00pm
EDT**

Plenary – Federal Agency Updates – Agency representatives from the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Office of Naval Research, Environmental Protection Agency, and the 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](#).

[Video](#)
[NSF Slides](#)
[NIH Slides](#)
[NASA Slides](#)
[ONR Slides](#)
[EPA Slides](#)
[GUIRR Slides](#)

**Tuesday,
September
22, 2020,
1:00pm-
2:30pm
EDT**

eRA and the Research Administration Committee – SciENCv – This session featured information, updates, and reminders from NSF (Jean Feldman) and NIH (Bart Trawick) on the use of SciENCv, as well as presentations from Amanda Hamaker of Purdue University and Lori Schultz of the University of Arizona on how SciENCv is being utilized at their institutions.

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

For the purposes of NSF, please see the link to the presentation and direct questions to the NSF Policy Office at policy@nsf.gov.

NIH reaffirmed the goals of using SciENCv, namely reducing administrative burden, leveraging and extending data to and from external systems, and tracking the impact of federal investments in science and scientist careers through scientist-curated data and provided an overview of current functionality. The institutional perspective provided by Purdue and University of Arizona revealed that while the delegate function allows institutions to provide a significant amount of support to PIs, there is still at least some degree of PI data entry required, and PIs are still responsible for ensuring the accuracy of proposal documents produced in SciENCv. While institutions are strongly encouraging the use of SciENCv, fillable forms still seem to be the current preference among PIs.

Tuesday,
September
22, 2020,
2:30pm-
4:00pm
EDT

Subawards Subcommittee – It was announced that, after four years of service, Stephanie Scott (Columbia University) will be stepping away from her role as Subaward Subcommittee Co-Chair, to transition to her new role as Co-Chair of the Communications Committee. Kevin Ritchie (Harvard) will complete his transition as Stephanie’s replacement as Co-Chair.

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

Kevin then led a discussion on the final report of the Subawards Delay Survey and requested a few polls to determine a baseline for how to determine when a delay has occurred in processing subaward agreements. The poll showed that about 45 days is a reasonable amount of time for a subrecipient to anticipate a draft subaward agreement; this means that, with a 45-day baseline, any amount of time beyond that would be considered a delay. Other polls during this session requested information on what the primary reason would be for a PTE to delay issuing and fully-executing a subaward; the results showed that the setup of the initial prime award and issuance of a draft of the subaward were the reasons for the most delays. Some of the survey results were discussed, and it appeared that one of the biggest sources of delays were waiting for documents from the academic departments. As such, future working group activities could include reviewing the recently published [Research Report: Primary Findings of the 2018 Faculty Workload Survey](#) to identify other causes for delays.

Other updates:

FDP Subaward Templates: Recent Uniform Guidance (UG) revisions are not yet incorporated into the current FDP Subaward templates. A working group is reviewing the changes and identifying areas in the templates that will need revisions. Separately, the current FDP Amendment templates were updated with non-substantive changes.

Research security and foreign influence: A discussion centered around institutions that have started including additional certification language in their Subrecipient Letters of Intent (LOI) to ensure subrecipients have disclosed in their Current and Pending Support and biosketches that all appointments, affiliations and support have been disclosed. Alternative options were discussed to reduce burden.

Force Majeure: COVID-19 may seem to be a good reason to amend your subawards to include a force majeure clause, but it is not necessary. Sample language is available on the [Subawards Forms webpage](#) for those interested.

Wednesday,
September
23, 2020,
11:00am-
12:30pm
EDT

eRA – Research.gov – For purposes of NSF, please see link to presentation.

For assistance, contact NSF IT Help Central via email at ITHelpCentral@nsf.gov or by phone at 703-292-HELP (x4357) or 1-800-711-8084.

To provide Research.gov feedback: <https://www.research.gov/research-web/feedback>”

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

Wednesday,
September
23, 2020,
1:30pm-
2:30pm
EDT

Finance, Audit, and Costing Policy Committee – This session was an open discussion to help identify areas of interest and re-prioritize activities for the FAC Committee. Prior to this session, the co-chairs asked registrants to participate in a *thoughtexchange*, to collect data and identify themes of where the primary focus areas should be for the Committee. The co-chairs emphasized that one of the end goals is to reduce administrative burden for faculty, staff and federal partners while implementing new and existing federal regulations. As a result of the discussion, they plan to set up subcommittees to begin examining the issues and work on potential projects.

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

Topics discussed, include:

FFR/FCTR/SubAcct/LOC

There will be a reduction of administrative burden concerning FFRs/FCTRs/ SubAcct/LOC very soon.

Phase 1: Beginning 1/1/2021, NIH grant recipients will be required to submit the SF-425 FFR in the Payment Management System (PMS) as opposed to the eRACommons/FFR Module.

Phase 2: Beginning in early FY21, recipients will no longer be required to submit the quarterly FCTR. Instead, only need to certify at the time of drawdown that funds will be used timely and in accordance with the cost principles and terms and conditions.

A subcommittee may be formed to explore nuances to subaccounting and monitor how these new changes with FFRs and FCTRs are coming along. There was some discussion centered around the amount of work involved to file amended FFRs for small credits after an award has ended. Forming a subcommittee to examine this process might be worthwhile.

Harmonization: NSF and others have worked really closely, and NSF has led the way with Current & Pending Support and other initiatives. Want to continue to work on harmonization in all possible areas.

COVID-19 audits: there is an interest to protect both federal agencies and institutions. We want to make sure that both federal agencies and institutions come together with clear, consistent information.

Data Storage Costs, Cloud Computing, and Associated F&A: Talked about the need to do data storage long after the grant has ended per federal agency expectations. How do we get auditors on board for keeping these costs allowable? These topics could form the creation of another subcommittee.

Next Steps: Top three areas the FAC may want to look resulting from this discussion are to continue to look at reducing financial reporting burden (small credits, LOC process, FCTR elimination, etc.), COVID-19 audits, Data Storage costs, and harmonization, which is the umbrella of it all. To stay informed and volunteer for upcoming subcommittees, FDP members should join the FDP-Costing-Finance-L@lsw.nas.edu listserv by signing up at <http://thefdp.org/default/mailling-lists/>.

**Wednesday
September
23, 2020,
3:00pm-
4:30pm
EDT**

Faculty Forum and Business Meeting – The session was focused on a review of the third faculty workload survey, which found that there is an increasing trend in the total time taken away from active research from 42.3% of the time in the previous two surveys to 44.3% in the 2018 survey. Some of the themes that were discussed concerning what this higher workload is associated with are: being a public institution and having lower research expenditures; a higher volume of training, curriculum, and service related projects; perceived lack of administrators' trust in PIs; perceived ineffective pre- and post-award assistance; a higher volume of animal and human subject research; a higher number of proposals submitted per PI; having funded projects from more than one funding agency; and whether a PI is female, Hispanic, or Black/African American. The full report of primary findings can be found at [Research Report: Primary Findings of the 2018 Faculty Workload Survey](#).

[Slides](#)

**Wednesday,
September
23, 2020,
4:30pm-
6:00pm
EDT**

Conflict of Interest Subcommittee – This was a kick-off meeting of the newly formed Conflict of Commitment (CoC) Working Group, under the direction of the Conflict of Interest (COI) Subcommittee. This working group is led by Dr. Alice Young, Research Integrity Officer & faculty representative, Texas Tech, and Amanda Humphrey, MA, Director of Research Integrity & Export Controls, Northeastern University. The session started with an overview of several federal agencies' COI policies, and then review of a chart of how each federal agency is currently requiring CoC disclosures (via Current & Pending Support, Other Support, etc.). The session then broke out into Zoom breakout rooms to go through

[Slides](#)

a working group exercise. Each group had an open discussion to discuss best practices, and challenges, using NIH's activities chart to drive the discussion, located at <https://grants.nih.gov/policy/protecting-innovation.htm>. After the group exercises, everyone reconvened to share common challenges and ideas for potential exploration to reduce burden in this area. Faculty and administrators expressed challenges in the reporting of unpaid activities and in-kind contributions. Some institutions have CoC policies, while others are currently exploring existing policies or creating them. Exploring IT solutions for capturing all appointments, support, and activities, such as SciENcv, ORCID, and other systems, may be worthwhile for future discussions to reduce burden for faculty and administrators alike.

Next Steps: FDP members interested in participating in this working group, and to sign up for the COI Subcommittee listserv to be updated on workgroup activities, should contact Mary Lee, COI Subcommittee Co-Chair at marylee@stanford.edu, Amanda Humphrey, CoC Working Group Co-Chair at a.humphrey@northeastern.edu, and Dr. Alice Young, CoC Working Group Co-Chair at Alice.Young@ttu.edu.

Thursday,
September
24, 2020,
11:00am-
12:30pm
EDT

CUSP and Universal Protocol Development Update – This session included updates on two of the burden reducing initiatives outlined in the 21st Century Cures Act (the Compliance Unit Standard Procedure (CUSP) Sharing Site and the Universal Protocol Template (UPT)).

[CUSP Slides](#)
[UPT Slides](#)
[Video](#)

Aubrey Schoenleben (University of Washington) provided a brief update on the CUSP project. The goal of this project is to develop an online venue where participating institutions can share standard procedures used in animal research protocols. The working group continues to focus on site development and testing. Development has been delayed slightly due to COVID, and beta testing is now anticipated to start this fall. The working group has also been focused on building the underlying infrastructure that will support the site, once implemented, developing business processes for new institution onboarding, creating help documents/supporting materials, and updating the CUSP page on the FDP website.

Bill Greer (University of Michigan) and Ron Banks (University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center) provided an update on the UPT. The goal of the UPT 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 is under development. The working group is aiming to complete the draft by the end of the year. Following this, the UPT draft will undergo user testing to gather feedback from key stakeholders (e.g., researchers, IACUC administrators, IACUC members, veterinarians).

Next Steps: If you are interested in joining the CUSP working group or the UPT working group, please email Aubrey Schoenleben (aubreys@uw.edu) or Bill Greer (wggreer@umich.edu).

Thursday,
September
24, 2020,
1:00pm-
2:30pm
EDT

The Faculty and Administrator Partnership: How Important is Trust? – This session by the Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT) began with a brief introduction to FACT and an overview of its mission, and then focused primarily on FACT's current project of exploring how trust impacts administrative burden. Steven Post and Susan Alstadt (both of University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences) reviewed a recent *ThoughtExchange* survey on what institutions can do and/or should do to promote trust in research. The survey revealed eight "top thoughts" ranging from accountability and honesty to effective communications and transparency in decision making (see slides for full detail). A poll was then taken of session attendees on which "thoughts" they ranked to be the most

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

important, and the top three were accountability/owning mistakes, honesty and transparency, and transparency in decision making. Robert Nobles (Emory University) then discussed an Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) Council of Research (COR) workshop series for new and future VPRs which showed that the percentage of time taken away from research has increased slightly over the last decade and a half, but more importantly that there is a direct correlation between the strength of the culture of trust at an institution and the level of faculty administrative burden. Jason Carter (Montana State University) followed with an exploration of strategies for how to rate trust, how best to build trust, and in doing so how to take into account junior, mid-level, and senior faculty, underrepresented faculty groups, and soft-money funded researchers. The session ended with a review of the FACT “top thoughts” and an open discussion of what faculty and administrators can do to foster a culture of trust at their institutions.

**Thursday,
September
24, 2020,
3:00pm-
4:30pm
EDT**

Expanded Clearinghouse, Open Government and newly forming Proposal Initiatives – Wade Wargo (Office of Naval Research) and Lynette Arias (University of Washington) opened the session with a quick overview of the Research Administration Committee and its working groups and subcommittees. Courtney Swaney (University of Texas) then provided updates on the Expanded Clearinghouse Steering Committee, with a timeline for entering and publishing of Cohort 7 and Cohort 8 profiles plans for revising the financial questionnaire for non-Single Audit Institutions. Pamela Webb (University of Minnesota) was up next with a discussion of the collaboration with University of Kent in the UK and the development of a clearinghouse for British institutions and how FDP might leverage such international clearinghouses in validation of foreign subawardees (and vice versa) in the future, while also touching briefly on the Safe Harbor provision to be included in the upcoming revised version of Uniform Guidance. Open Government Subcommittee Co-Chair Richard Fenger (University of Washington) picked up from there, and provided an overview of the Subcommittee, its original projects, current initiatives, and expected next stages. The final segment of the presentation featured Amanda Hamaker (Purdue) and Lori Schultz (Arizona) discussing the Proposal Initiatives project, with a summary of current initiatives relating to SciENCv and Research.gov, and potential future projects such as expanded use of Just-in-Time and pre-proposals to reduce pre-award administrative burden. The session concluded with an extended discussion and Q&A session which covered a wide range of topics, and members are encouraged to watch the video of the session.

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

**Friday,
September
25, 2020,
1:00pm-
2:30pm
EDT**

Contracts and Data Transfer and Use Agreement Updates – This session, led by Alex Albinak (Johns Hopkins), Martha Davis (Brandeis), and Melissa Korf (Harvard Medical School) began with a discussion Section 889 of the FY19 NDAA that went into effect on August 13, 2020, specifically the impacts of the prohibitions relating to covered telecommunications products and services and how institutions are managing the new requirements. A poll question during this session revealed that most institutions are just beginning to plan ways to address these changes. The next topic covered was CMMC (Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification), and again polling showed that the majority of institutions are in the early stages of developing compliance plans. This was followed by discussion of the challenges posed by CMMC, such as how to justify and pay for the costs involved in complying with the CMMC requirements, and the suggestion that FAQs and best practices guidance would be helpful for institutions in developing their plans. After briefly touching on the anticipated CUI FAR clause and expected public comment period, the session closed with updates on DTUAs (Data Transfer and Use Agreements), a walkthrough of the Reciprocal DTUA template and Collaborative DTUA sample, and a call for volunteers to assist in future efforts. For suggestions and volunteer inquiries, contact Martha Davis at mrdavis@brandeis.edu or Melissa Korf at Melissa.Korf@hms.harvard.edu.

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

FDP MEETING ADJOURNED

