



## Quick meeting summary

The FDP conducted its Winter 2022 conference virtually from Monday, January 10, 2022, through Thursday, January 13, 2022. The following document provides a quick review of the sessions and topics, along with links to slides and video of the presentations.

**Monday,  
January 10,  
2022,  
11:00am-  
12:30pm EST**

**Plenary – Update from President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST)** – Moderator Dr. Richard Seligman introduced speaker, Dr. Maria Zuber, co-chair of PCAST and Vice President for Research at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and set the stage for a “fireside chat” format for exploring the work of PCAST. Dr. Zuber began by describing that there are two presidentially-appointed advisory bodies. The first, the National Science Board (NSB), oversees NSF, advises the president, and once appointed requires no further presidential authorization for further action. The second, begun in the Roosevelt administration, is the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), which advises on science policy through written reports sent directly to the president. PCAST works as needed with Congress and closely with federal agencies for input but does not need congressional or agency approval prior to providing information to the president. PCAST meetings are open to the public. Additionally, there is the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), part of the Executive Branch, that advises the president and is directed by the president’s science advisor, Dr. Eric Lander, who also serves on PCAST.

[Video](#)

At the outset of his administration, President Joseph R. Biden presented his priorities for PCAST via five questions as follows: (1) What can be learned from the pandemic?; (2) What can be done about climate change?; (3) How can the US lead the world in the development of new technologies and industries?; (4) How can we guarantee that the fruits of science and innovation benefit all Americans?; and (5) How can we ensure the long term health of science and technology in the US? Dr. Zuber commented on PCAST’s consideration of the president’s questions above. Watch the video for the full fireside chat.

**Monday,  
January 10,  
2022,  
2:30pm-  
4:30pm EST**

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

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

**Monday,  
January 10,  
2022,  
5:00pm-  
6:00pm EST**

**Overview of proposed new NSF Directorate: Technology, Innovation and Partnerships** – Erwin Gianchandani and Gracie Narcho, Senior Advisors in the Office of the Director at the National Science Foundation (NSF), presented on the proposed new NSF Directorate for Technology, Innovation and Partnerships (TIP). TIP would be “horizontal” to enhance use-inspired and translational

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

research. The ultimate aim of TIP is to support advances at the intersection of critical and emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and quantum information science, and national and societal challenges, such as climate change, equitable access to education and health care, and critical and resilient infrastructure. Through this effort, TIP stands to enhance US competitiveness in the long term. A key aspect of TIP that Erwin and Gracie described is the importance that will be placed on the geography of innovation, that is, designing into TIP's programs ways to engage the full spectrum of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics talent (or potential talent), regardless of background, organizational affiliation, or geographic location. Proposed new funding of \$500M for TIP is included in the President's FY 2022 budget, along with \$364.87M of realigned investments. NSF funding priorities for FY22 were presented, including advancing the Nation's technology and innovation ecosystem through Regional Innovation Accelerators, accelerating the translation of research results to society through enhancements to NSF's Lab-to-Market Platform, and nurturing and growing educational opportunities for all students including experiential internships.

**Tuesday,  
January 11,  
2022,  
11:00am-  
12:30pm EST**

**Research Administration Committee** – This session was led by Committee Co-Chair Lynette Arias from University of Washington. It also included Alice Young, Texas Tech University, Faculty Liaison, who discussed soliciting input on how to increase faculty participation in this committee. The presentation began with an overview of the Research Administration Committee, its subcommittees, and their members. ThoughtExchange was used to gather information on specific ideas that could reduce administrative burden in pre-award administration. Much of the session focused on the Contracts Subcommittee and Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittee.

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

The Contracts Subcommittee provided an update on the status of the new Troublesome Clauses Database 2.0, which is expanding to a searchable dynamic database. Other current initiatives include a FAR Guidance Document, Other Transaction Authority, Fundamental Research justification language, Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) monitoring language and negotiations, and National Laboratory language review and negotiations. Members are encouraged to reach out with ideas and suggestions on new topics for the subcommittee to address in the future.

The Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittee provided general updates on recent enhancements. The primary focus was on Subrecipient Commitment Forms and Letters of Intent, and proposed revisions to audit related questions which are proposed for future implementation. Participants are encouraged to reach out to [ExpClearinghouse@thefdp.org](mailto:ExpClearinghouse@thefdp.org) if you have any questions about the Clearinghouse.

**Tuesday,  
January 11,  
2022,  
1:00pm-  
2:30pm EST**

**Subawards Subcommittee** – The session opened with news that Amanda Humphrey will be stepping down as co-Chair, with an acknowledgement of her many contributions. Members were encouraged to apply to the new Co-Chair opportunity. Next, an overview of the Committee's recent FFATA survey was provided. Results from over 90 respondents have been reviewed by the FDP Executive Committee and sent to OMB; a summary will be shared by May. Next, there was a recap of the recent Subaward Invoice listening sessions. Many insights were collected from the over 460 participants, and analysis and next steps such as a possible new workgroup, clearinghouse additions, and membership survey will be coordinated with the Finance, Audit, and Costing Committee. The session next featured an update on Executive Order (EO) 14042 requiring COVID Safety Protocols for federal contractors. The order's implementing FAR clause (52.223-99) is currently delayed due to litigation in federal courts. Since the order does not apply to grants, there is no plan to modify the subaward templates. Pending the outcome of litigation, institutions can modify the FDP subcontract sample to flowdown the FAR clause as applicable. Upcoming draft changes to Attachment 7 to better align with DTUA language and increase usage were announced. Changes will be sent to membership for input in

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

February, with analysis of results and a decision planned for March. Next, there was a poll on the prevalence of Pass Through Entity restrictions of subrecipient indirect costs when the prime award allows full indirect costs recovery. Examples included multi-site clinical trials, pilot subgrants, and NIFA prime awards. The Committee is seeking more input to help provide clarity to this issue. In response to member inquiries seeking better system integration and automation of templates, the presenters provided background on using the Adobe format, and the subcommittee is seeking input regarding status of FDP template system integration at various institutions to determine how this can be further developed. Additionally, there was a discussion of FFRDCs and the challenges of collaboration, since FFRDCs require approval to work outside their prime contract, cannot accept UG terms, require advance payments, etc., and suggestions to streamline this process. The Committee will explore a possible future webinar on strategies to work with FFRDCs. Finally, brief Working Group updates were provided. Participants were reminded to send questions/issues to [subawards@thefdp.org](mailto:subawards@thefdp.org).

**Tuesday,  
January 11,  
2022,  
3:00pm-  
4:00pm EST**

**Finance, Costing, and Audit Committee** – Michelle Bulls (NIH Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration (OPERA)), Cindy Hope (Georgia Institute of Technology), Christi Keene (University of Chicago), along with other committee members presented on the committee’s continued efforts with a focus on reducing administrative burden in the areas of financial, audit, and costing policies. There was discussion about the potential for additional FAC subcommittees and/or working groups such as Treasury/NSF Grants Payment Pilot, Cash Management & Reporting Initiatives (joint initiatives between federal partners and institutions including FCTR Elimination, Treasury Offset, “Pennies” (de minimis refunds post-closeout), FFR Migration, and Training Grant reporting.

Melissa Korf (Harvard University) discussed the efforts of the Data Management and Sharing working group, specifically related to costing for data management. Data management costing concerns expressed by faculty at the September 2021 meeting included data storage at closeout, data security for specialized data and DMP monitoring and compliance during the life of the award through closeout. The working group’s charter was shared. There was a brief, very thorough, video shared from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) presented by Cynthia Hudson Vitale. A call was put out for members with strong cost accounting knowledge to join the Data Management and Sharing working group. A Thought Exchange was conducted during and after the session.

Lastly, the committee shared other prior and future efforts. Michelle Bulls conveyed that the FCTR will go away effective March 2022; NIH will provide communication shortly on how March quarterly reports will be handled. Continued challenges with the FFR Migration to PMS were discussed as well as key changes to the FY22 NIH Grants Policy Statement (GPS).

[Video](#)  
[Slides](#)  
[RADS Presentation](#)

**Tuesday,  
January 11,  
2022,  
4:30pm-  
6:00pm EST**

**Faculty Forum and Business Meeting** – Faculty Committee Chair Michele Masucci (Temple University) and Vice-chair Robert Nobles (Emory University) facilitated this session, which focused on the upcoming Faculty Workload Survey and next steps for FDP evaluation.

The Faculty Workload Survey (FWS) is a six-year cycle survey (last one was in 2018) of Federally-funded member institution PIs that aims to learn about faculty time commitments, namely time taken from research by required administrative tasks. The next iteration of the FWS will be implemented in 2024 and will ideally balance maintaining consistency (to compare certain topics over time) with addressing timely issues (e.g., COVID). Next steps include convening the FWS Working Group and issuing an RFP for the Survey Implementation team. Beyond these formalized groups, faculty can be involved in several ways including through scholarship related to the survey and participation in the survey’s design, scope, and focus.

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

Robert Nobles presented a “Deeper Dive on Evaluation,” building on his Faculty Forum presentation from the September 2021 FDP Meeting. The framework for evaluation includes the annual survey of membership conducted by an internal working group and an assessment of FDP to be performed by an external evaluation center. Next steps are to: 1) finalize review of the evaluation plan; 2) develop and implement the annual survey (anticipated launch March 2022); and 3) seek nominations and identify external evaluation center (anticipated screening and selection February/March 2022).

The session concluded with brief updates on faculty engagement across FDP, including updates from the Research Administration Committee and foreign influence working group.

**Wednesday,  
January 12,  
2022,  
11:00am-  
12:30pm EST**

**National Science Foundation Proposal Modernization Update** – Stephanie Yee, NSF IT Project Manager, presented on NSF’s proposal modernization update and how it affects research institutions. The target date to move all proposal submission functionality from FastLane to Research.gov is December 31, 2022. It was noted that FastLane does include other functionality, and this does not affect those modules. Grants.gov will continue to be an option to submit proposals. Approximately 70% of NSF funding opportunities are currently supported in Research.gov with some clearly specifying whether submission via Research.gov is available or required. NSF is working with both internal and external stakeholders to ensure a smooth transition. The advantages for PIs and research administrators of using Research.gov, proposal preparation tips in the system, and a capabilities status update were also discussed. There have been several enhancement releases in November 2021 that were outlined. A live review of new features was presented in the Research.gov demo site, with a focus also on advice for users based on what NSF is seeing. Once they move through full Research.gov transition, they can focus more on enhancements. Links to resources shared in this session are available in the posted slide deck.

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

**Wednesday,  
January 12,  
2022,  
1:00pm-  
2:30pm EST**

**Foreign Influence Working Group Key Updates** – Led by moderators Pamela Webb (University of Minnesota) and Jim Luther (FDP/Yale University), this session featured several speakers. Jean Feldman from NSF reported on tools available to facilitate disclosures on biographical sketch and current and pending support including the NSF Pre-award and Post-award Disclosures table, available [here](#). For SciENcv (which won’t allow 0% effort), NSF reminded attendees to report disclosable time commitments even if not paid. Michelle Bulls from NIH shared the link for the [NIH Disclosures Table](#), a helpful new resource for requirements that go into effect January 25, 2022. Links were provided to both the [NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance](#) and the [DARPA Risk Rubric](#).

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

Lori Schultz (University of Arizona) provided an update on work being done by the Key Investigator Clearinghouse (KIC workgroup), which is part of the Foreign Influence Working Group. The KIC working group also allies with a cross-organizational effort involving an FDP, COGR, APLU, and AAU effort to advance the concept of a “Uniform CV”. KIC is envisioned as a national investigator repository that would facilitate the gathering of required biosketches and other support data that would draw information from existing systems.

Robin Cyr (Northeastern University) and Amanda Humphrey (Northeastern University) also presented an update from the FIWG working group on creating a Matrix for Assessment of Risk and Transparency (MART). MART is a tool to facilitate collective assessment and discussion between faculty and institutions on the risks associated with many types of external engagements; it includes guidance on when disclosures to agencies may be needed.

These two initiatives are currently under development and the goal is for both systems to share data points. KIC and MART teams are working closely together.

**Wednesday,  
January 12,  
2022,  
3:00pm-  
4:00pm EST**

**Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT)** – Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT) – This session, led by co-chairs Steven Post and Suzanne Alstadt from the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, began with an overview of the FACT group. This overview included reviewing the mission of FACT, the participating faculty-administrator institutional teams currently serving on the working group, the expectations of the member teams, and previous group activities. Phase 1 (2018-2020) activities focused on quantitative and qualitative analyses that found institutional research processes and metrics vary significantly across institutions. Phase 2 (2020 on) activities of FACT have thus far focused on trust in the faculty-research administrator partnership. These activities build upon the Faculty Workload Survey results that associate the perception of trust at an institution with administrative burden. FACT findings and implications of ThoughtExchanges centered on defining the elements of trust in the partnership, lessons learned from the pandemic, and what faculty and research administrators can each do to improve the partnership were presented. The future goals of the group were also presented, followed by a brainstorming discussion focusing on the question of “What are possible future FACT initiatives that are aligned with the FDP mission of reducing administrative effort associated with federally funded research?” Some of the topics discussed included the role and development of institutional faculty-administrators (e.g., Associate Deans for Research), how FACT can assist with compiling resources, best practices for collaborative communication, universal metrics to evaluate the success in reducing burden for all, and a faculty - research administrator dictionary. The group is currently recruiting administrator-faculty teams. If interested in joining FACT as an administrator-faculty team or for more information, participants can email the co-chairs at [spost@uams.edu](mailto:spost@uams.edu) or [sealstadt@uams.edu](mailto:sealstadt@uams.edu).

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

**Wednesday,  
September 22,  
2021,  
4:30pm-  
6:00pm EST**

**Research Compliance Committee** – Speakers: Amanda Humphrey, Northeastern University; Lindsey Spangler, Duke University; Debra Murphy, Arizona State University; John Baumann, Indiana University; Christopher Martin, Rutgers; Jennifer Welch, Brown University; Aubrey Schoenleben, University of Washington; Sally Thompson-Iritani, University of Washington. The Research Compliance Committee provided updates and facilitated discussion around Human Subjects, Data Stewardship, and Conflict of Interest Subcommittee activities. They also provided updates on the outcomes of the IACUC MOU working group, progress of the Compliance Unit Standard Procedure (CUSP) initiative, and potential new committee projects.

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

The CUSP Project, which aims to create an online venue for institutions to share standard animal care procedures to reduce administrative burden on researchers, is in progress with the Beta site completed in May 2021. IACUC MOU Working group discussed that the process to review community feedback has been completed and the sample MOU for FDP member institutions will be posted shortly. Human Subjects subcommittee is looking for volunteers for new working groups; contact Debra Murphy [Debra.Murphy@asu.edu](mailto:Debra.Murphy@asu.edu) or John Baumann [baumannj@iu.edu](mailto:baumannj@iu.edu) if interested. Data Stewardship Subcommittee continued discussion regarding the 2023 NIH DMSP requirements. DTUA Group discussed the development of smart PDFs for DTUA templates and the creation of a flowchart for use when a DTUA is required. COI Subcommittee discussed the scope of their charter and requested volunteers for their working group. If interested, contact Lindsey Spangler [lindsey.spangler@duke.edu](mailto:lindsey.spangler@duke.edu) or Amanda Humphrey [a.humphrey@northeastern.edu](mailto:a.humphrey@northeastern.edu).

**Thursday,  
January 13,  
2022,  
3:00pm-  
4:00pm EST**

**January 2022 Release of NSPM-33 Guidance (Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33)** – Pamela Webb, Jim Luther, Lori Schultz, and Lynette Arias presented major takeaways from the just-released [Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33](#). They also provided a Thought Exchange for continued feedback and discussion on the document; at this time, the [Thought Exchange is still open for contributions](#), and the presenters strongly encourage FDP members to continue doing so. There are 11 major takeaways in all, outlined in the slides. These include the emphasis on harmonization among federal agencies in how the memo is implemented; this

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

provides an opportunity for FDP to provide input on reducing the administrative burden associated with compliance. Additionally, clarity of expectations, training on expected compliance, and well-described enforcement rules by the agencies are pushed in the guidance. It also creates an obligation for “complete, current, and accurate” disclosures, which must include any applications or memberships in foreign talent development programs, that can be shared among agencies under certain circumstances. The guidance further defines what must, and what must not, be disclosed; who is subject to the requirements; culpability in the case of noncompliance; and pushes for harnessing technology to drive toward DPIs/PIDs in an effort to reduce administrative burden of disclosure. Presenters brought up areas for discussion: privacy protections in the face of agencies’ sharing disclosed information before final judgments are made; the need to better define what a “gift” in this sense is; timing and updates of implementation which is unclear; the definition of consulting provided by the guidance; notice and due process of investigations; and other related topics.

**Thursday,  
January 13,  
2021,  
4:30pm-  
6:00pm EST**

**Committee Report Outs** – This session focused on providing updates from several of the FDP committees and working groups, such as: Membership Committee, Communications Committee, Research System & Technology Committee (formerly the eRA Committee), the Evaluation Working Group and the Reimagining FDP Meetings Working Group.

[Video  
Slides](#)

#### Membership Committee

Jeanne Hermann-Petrin, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Maria Koszalka, National Science Foundation and Larry Sutter, Michigan Technological University discussed the FDP profiles and encouraged members to review and update the profiles. Profiles will be used to recruit new FDP committee members using skills and experience sections. A demonstration and instructions on how to update the profile was shared and can be obtained in the presentation.

#### Communications Committee

Stephanie Scott, Columbia University and Communications Committee Chair provided an overview of the goals of the Communications Committee, as well as the current working groups under this committee: Session Summaries, Marketing, Policies & Procedures and Website. This team is currently working with a PR and marketing firm on an overall Communications Strategic Plan for the FDP, per the FDP Phase VII Strategic Plan. Once the plan is complete the next phase will be to modernize and update the FDP website.

#### Research System & Technology Committee (RSTC) (formerly the eRA Committee)

David Saunders, Co-Chair, National Science Foundation and Lori Schultz, Co-Chair, University of Arizona provided an in-depth overview of the changes with technology and the impact it has today. This included the name change to RSTC, and a new purpose for this committee to “Advocate for, optimize, and integrate technology solutions across the full life cycle of the research enterprise”. The committee will issue a request for new members soon, with a preference for smaller institutions, including PUIs, ERIs, and non-university institutions.

#### Evaluation Working Group

Michele Masucci, Chair of the Faculty Committee on behalf of Robert Nobles, Vice Chair of the Faculty Committee provided an update on the working group’s activities such as, the annual satisfaction and outcome survey; external evaluation to focus on effectiveness of resources allocation, documenting level of success, accountability requirement, and the creation of a report that incorporates the successes and opportunity areas for FDP. Report is currently pending approval.

#### Reimagining FDP Meeting (RFM)

Miriam Campo, Florida Atlantic University, and Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State University, Co-Chairs of RFM discussed the goals of the RFM working group which is a new group established August 2021. RFM team is working on a survey to evaluate the preference of the FDP membership regarding virtual, in-person or

hybrid meetings as well as the most effective formats for meeting sessions. The team plans to provide survey results and recommendations by the May 2022 FDP meeting.

**Thursday,  
September 23,  
2021,  
6:00pm EDT**

**FDP Meeting Adjourned**