



FDP
Federal
Demonstration
Partnership

FDP Meeting Summary

5/10/2017 - 5/12/2017

Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) and FISMA

Point of Contact

Makr Sweet

Activities/Progress to Date

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Participation

Key Risks/Issues

Meeting Summary

This session was an update of some of the current issues surrounding Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) and FISMA. The presenters provided an overview of CUI. The panel discussed issue, challenges, approaches to addressing CUI on their campuses. Please see presentation for additional information and presenter contact information.



Research Terms and Conditions

Point of Contact	Richard Seligman
Activities/Progress to Date	The FDP has been working with the Co-Chairs of the Research Business Models Working Group to review and comment on the Research Terms and Conditions, a set of general provisions applicable to research grants issued by a group of Federal agencies, including: NASA, NIH, NSF, USDA, Department of Commerce, Department of Energy, EPA, FAA, and Department of Homeland Security.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	
Participation	The panel participants included Jean Feldman, NSF; Samuel Ashe, NIH; Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota; and Richard Seligman, California Institute of Technology.
Key Risks/Issues	
Meeting Summary	The panel presented a review of the current status of the Research Terms and Conditions, including its component parts, The Prior Approval Matrix, Subaward Requirements, National Policy Requirements Matrix, Agency Implementation Schedule, and the Agency Specific Requirements that have been issued thus far. The FDP will continue to work with the Federal agencies that are implementing the Research Terms and Conditions.



Expanded Clearinghouse

Point of Contact	Lynette Arias, Pamela Webb, Jennifer Barron
Activities/Progress to Date	Web-based system went live on April 26th! Cohorts 1 and 2 are currently entering their profiles in the new system. Cohort 3 will go live the first week in July. We are encouraging all FDP members not currently in the pilot to join Cohort 3. Future enhancements include: pull data from other systems, as feasible (SAM); automatic notifications to POC for expired information; API's (Application Program Interface); additional reports and data output. Working group for non-single audit organization financial questionnaire and integration with RAQ continues work.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	Pilot Final Report expected to be submitted to FDP Executive Committee by the September Meeting.
Participation	Session was attended by approximately 100 individuals, most of whom are currently part of the Pilot and some others who are interested in joining the Pilot in the future.
Key Risks/Issues	<p>Risks moving forward include entities not using the clearinghouse profiles as originally planned, not keeping their profiles current, entities still continuing to use their forms that they are comfortable with.</p> <p>Issues identified include the level of effort required both by organizations and clearinghouse working group to maintain the Profiles, the limited resources to make improvements to the online system.</p>
Meeting Summary	A brief overview and purpose of the Pilot was discussed, including description of cohort 1 and 2, timelines for the Pilot and the Pilot website, entities and current status of the Pilot. Tracking data to date was shared, as well as time saved metrics. We saw a demonstration of the completed web-based system. Next steps in the Pilot were discussed along with how entities can get involved in the future.



Grants.gov Workspace

Point of Contact	Debbi Nixon, Ron Splittgerber
Activities/Progress to Date	Met with Grants.gov team on Wednesday May 10 before the FDP meeting in preparation for this session (and other topics)
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	There is a question about university preparedness for this change. It requires someone to set up the WorkSpace and assign roles to complete and submit an application.
Participation	Speakers: Judy Ceresa, Grants.gov; Nicole Daniel, Grants.gov; Diane Schroeder, Grants.gov; Kavitha Vemula, Grants.gov; Ed Tan, Grants.gov
Key Risks/Issues	Communication and education for universities. Jim Kresl established a Trello Board to help develop a plan. Grants.gov is participating as well with Ed Tan from the Grants.gov Communication Team noting: I just wanted to let you know that I signed up to review the FDP Trello Board to help provide some information for our upcoming Grants.gov Community Blog articles. Also, when it is ready we will send you a draft of our Workspace For Universities article for your review and input.
Meeting Summary	Grants.gov will provide a live demonstration of how to apply using Workspace and the new online forms capability. Grants.gov plans to phase out the Legacy PDF, on December 31, 2017; and, we will be available to answer any questions you may have regarding Workspace features.



DATA Act

Point of Contact	Richard Fenger UWash, Mark Sweet UW-Madison
Activities/Progress to Date	No workgroup activity for this session. Presentations from Treasury and the DATA Act PMO on status as the May 9th due date on DATA Act deliverables passed
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	n/a - see next meeting summary
Participation	Presenters: Renata Maziarz - Treasury Christopher Zeleznik - DATA Act PMO - NIH and DHHS General Audience with Q & A
Key Risks/Issues	For our Sept session the DATA Act PMO will be able to present the results of the feedback they have captured over the last couple of years inclusive of the sessions we hosted at FDP. Their report to congress regarding transparency and process effectiveness and efficiency should be available.
Meeting Summary	Please see slides linked from the main site for update content (slides under DATA Act, http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_179181) 80 attendees Good questions around the use of the new betaUSASpending.gov dataset from Treasury. Included discussion on usage of dataset



Subawards

Point of Contact

Amanda Humphrey, Stephanie Scott, Amanda Hamaker

Activities/Progress to Date

Foreign Templates: Many details included in the slides. The sample templates will be shared for feedback soon. Open for comments and suggestions.
Subcontracts Sample: In the process of being updated – Committee working on this. See slides for details.
RAQ/CAT: Under development. Working closely with the clearinghouse group.
Fixed Price Prior Approval: New working group developing template language and having discussion on the impact to clinical trials.
Subaward Templates Updates: Received 105 comments from the community. Working through them to update the templates for Fall.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

Carryover Survey:
Received 97 responses, but not everyone responded to every question. Will be reaching out to the working group to follow-up on next steps.
Highlighted some of the results – see slides.
Discussion:
Discussion over whether or not the PTE PI should have control over carryforward.
How will FDP help institutions talk to OIG about subrecipient monitoring if mandated?
Made it clear that the mandate would be to not “automatically restrict” but rather to only restrict in circumstances that make sense. Idea would be to provide options/other tools to manage risk so that carryforward isn’t the only tool.
Need something we can use to show our institutions how the small decision to restrict carryforward upfront has a huge trickle down impact on the amount of work required to manage the award.

Participation

Estimate approximately 210 people attended this session. There is broad participation from many volunteers on the various working groups.

Volunteers are always requested to assist with the working groups. See updates provided above.

Key Risks/Issues

Carryover Survey:
Received 97 responses, but not everyone responded to every question. Will be reaching out to the working group to follow-up on next steps.
Highlighted some of the results – see slides.
Discussion:
Discussion over whether or not the PTE PI should have control over carryforward.
How will FDP help institutions talk to OIG about subrecipient monitoring if mandated?
Made it clear that the mandate would be to not “automatically restrict” but rather to only



FDP

**Federal
Demonstration
Partnership**

FDP Meeting Summary

5/10/2017 - 5/12/2017

restrict in circumstances that make sense. Idea would be to provide options/other tools to manage risk so that carryforward isn't the only tool.
Need something we can use to show our institutions how the small decision to restrict carryforward upfront has a huge trickle down impact on the amount of work required to manage the award.

Meeting Summary



eRA Federal Agency Matrix Working Group

Point of Contact	Lynda Wolter
Activities/Progress to Date	The eRA Working Group met several times via conference call over the past several months. The goal of this working group is to update the 2003 matrix of agency systems and collect additional information regarding each system.
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	The working group agreed that the results should be sortable by both Agency and System. The information should be in a downloadable format, such as excel, to allow for local annotation of account users or other local data. The detailed data collection sheets should also be made available.
Participation	Volunteer members of the eRA Working Group
Key Risks/Issues	
Meeting Summary	At the May FDP meeting the Working Group met to review the current inventory of agency systems documented and discussed how to display the results by Agency and by System. Next steps are to collect information on the remaining agencies, review all the information, create the document to display the information, and provide summary of key findings. The working group also discussed ways to maintain the data such as reviewing as selection of systems prior to each FDP meeting.



Membership Standing Committee

Point of Contact	Katherine Kissmann
Activities/Progress to Date	<p>Registration desk – provide assistance to FDP staff at each meeting</p> <p>Institutional mentoring – match new attendee institutions with mentors, as requested</p> <p>ERI activities – work with ERI to facilitate their efforts and become a separate committee</p> <p>Member attendance and feedback – work with FDP staff to monitor attendance and provide feedback</p> <p>Annual report - review, analyze and summarize for Executive Committee</p> <p>Election – Gather candidate statements and photos for website for voting</p>
Agenda/Discussion Points	
Pending Decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Incorporation of Faculty Engagement Working Group into Membership Committee
Participation	<p>Susan Anderson – College of Charleston; Lynette Arias – University of Washington; Webb Brightwell – Harvard University; Sarah Cody – Texas Tech University; Andrea Deaton – University of Oklahoma; MaryAnn Deom – University of Georgia; Amy Green – University of California, Irvine; Jeanne Hermann – University of Tennessee Health Science Center; Delores Markey – Boston University; David Martin – Emory University; Jennifer Morehead Farmer – Governors State University; Debra Murphy – Arizona State University</p>
Key Risks/Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Engage Claudette Baylor-Fleming and David Wright to determine what the current process is to update membership data and request a written procedure for attendance and registration data capture (outstanding as of the January meeting) •Update listserv for Membership Committee •Assist David Wright with election for Chair and Vice Chair •Review and summarize annual report data for Executive Committee •Assist with website reconstruction/maintenance •Institutional profiles should be updated annually – may need to remind participants and instruct them which fields should be updated, if necessary. The federal expenditure information requested on the profile data is outdated and may need to be updated. •Possible incorporation of the Faculty Engagement Working Group into Membership Committee •Plan to engage more federal agency participation
Meeting Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •New Administrative Co-Chair <p>Larry Sutter introduced Katherine Kissmann as the new administrative chair of the Membership Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Annual Report – The annual report was released on May 1 and is due May 31. This year’s report will mainly be used to capture data on the institution’s representatives and participation in committees. The report includes four open-ended questions. The annual reports will be sent to the membership committee for review, analysis and summary to the



Executive Committee. A call for volunteers was made to help with review and analysis.

- Website: The webpage is currently under review by the Communications Committee. The membership committee may be asked to assist with the review.

- FDP Chair and Vice Chair Election

A call for nominations was sent to the general listserv for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions and will close on June 2. The membership committee will contact candidates to ensure that they are willing to run and will finalize the slate of candidates. On June 16 the candidate statements and photos will be posted on the website and voting begins June 19. July 14 voting will close and the results will be published on July 21. The formal change of administration will occur at the September meeting.

- Member Attendance and Engagement

Membership has grown to >400 in attendance at the meetings. Original intent was for attendees of the meetings to get involved in the demonstrations and participate and serve on committees. Due to increased attendance it is hard for everyone to be engaged in all activities and/or know how to become engaged. Communications regarding the working groups and pilots has also become complicated with the increased number of attendees. Much discussion regarding how to keep members engaged when they leave the meetings and the use of the website and listservs. Also discussed the option of a more formalized process for joining committees and for providing status of committee work to the membership. Committee chairs have a large burden in keeping up with who is attending, who compromises the committees, workgroups, etc. A suggestion was made to formalize the administrative support for committees as well as a formal announcement to be sent to entire membership when working groups are being formed to allow all that are interested to participate. Suggestion was made to update the meeting summaries to include a section for volunteer opportunities and a contact for each opportunity. Suggestion was made to recommend to the Executive Committee more formality around committee management and communication of the status of committee endeavors.

- Individual Institution vs. Whole System Membership – Lynette Arias will prepare a white paper on her findings on individual institution vs. whole system membership based upon her experience working with institutional information while working on the Clearinghouse data. This information will be taken into consideration in preparation for membership criteria for the next phase.

Other Business

- Engaging new federal partners – A meeting will take place after the conclusion of the January FDP meeting with the federal agencies to discuss their relationship with FDP and the value they receive from FDP. Charisse indicated that she will follow up on the results of that discussion and provide an update to the committee. Charisse will also follow up to determine if the current federal partners have demonstrated interest into continuing into the next phase. NASA's involvement was specifically inquired of.

- Faculty/Administrative Engagement – Forming a working group to discuss how to get faculty more engaged in FDP. The working group will need a home and the recommendation is that it fall within the Membership Committee. Some felt that this is a cross-committee issue and should be handled jointly with the Communications Committee.



ADMINISTRATIVE COST WORKING GROUP

Point of Contact

Activities/Progress to Date

The Administrative Cost Working Group continues to work on and discuss several important topics related to implementation of the Uniform Guidance. More recently the implementation of NIH's Single IRB (sIRB) requirements has become critical. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal and university representatives. The working group is focused on efficient and effective implementation of the Uniform Guidance and sIRB requirements.

Agenda/Discussion Points

Pending Decisions

- As discussed in the session, NIH is removing or editing some of the Costing FAQs. http://osp.od.nih.gov/sites/default/files/FAQs_on_sIRB_Costs.pdf
- Whether there will be additional direct cost funding for sIRB costs.
- Whether infrastructure awards will be available to update/replace IRB systems to facilitate sIRB

Participation

Federal representatives, and University faculty and administrative representatives.

Key Risks/Issues

- Increased cost of the IRB process
- Costs of commercial IRB is not known at this time
- Increased workload for IRB staff and panels
- Need for updated or new electronic IRB systems to accommodate use by multiple sites
- Time to prepare for sIRB implementation was extended by four months to September 25, 2017 (NOT-OD-17-027). However, institutions of higher education (IHEs) are still concerned about the amount of work and systems updates that need to be made prior to the September deadline. Some institutions are seeking a further extension of the implementation date.
- Direct charging sIRB costs will reduce other costs that can be direct charged to sponsored projects
- The administrative burden associated with applicability to Social and/or Behavioral research is significant without associated benefits.
- Readiness of institutions to function as the sIRB. Implications include adequate personnel and technology resources.

Meeting Summary

The topics and key risks described above were discussed at this session.