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Today’s Topics

• Research Admin Committee
  • Brief overview of committee scope and activities

• Current Activities/Updates on 3 areas
  • Proposal Initiatives
  • Expanded Clearinghouse
  • Open Government: Research Administration Data

• CY 2021 plans for RA Committee
Identify opportunities to make the administrative requirements imposed by federal sponsors simpler and less costly without compromising accountability. This includes contracting, proposal, award and subaward requirements and processes and general research administration areas not targeted for coverage by other standing committees.

**Faculty and Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT)**

**Open Govt: Research Administrative Data (OG:RAD)**

**Proposal Requirements Burden Reduction Initiative**

**Terms & Conditions**

**Contracts**

**Expanded Clearinghouse**

**Subawards**

**Enhance organizational faculty-administrator collaboration for successful research operations**

**Provides a forum to track, analyze, and streamline the impact of data driven initiatives stemming from various Federal Government directives**

**Historically focused on proposal systems via eRA Committee activities**

**Just getting started**

**Not currently active**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Subcommittee/Working Group</th>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Direction &amp; Oversight</td>
<td>Lynette Arias, University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD, Federal Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Subcommittee</td>
<td>Melissa Korf, Harvard Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisabeth Peloso, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayo, Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subawards Subcommittee</td>
<td>Amanda Humphrey, Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Ritchie, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittee</td>
<td>Courtney Swaney, University of Texas Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Moody, Boston VA Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government: Research Administration Data</td>
<td>Richard Fenger, University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avinash Tembulkar, NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Endy, Brown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Initiatives</td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Gray, University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Mosley, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Schultz, University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT)</td>
<td>Suzanne Alstadt, UAMS [admin co-chair]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Post, UAMS [faculty co-chair]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-large members</td>
<td>Stephanie Scott, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Exploratory Initiative

Stephanie Gray, University of Florida
Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University
Lisa Mosley, Yale University
Lori Schultz, University of Arizona

Co-leads of this exploratory initiative
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**Purpose:** To engage FDP in proposal related admin burden reduction initiatives focused on business processes and requirements

- Collaboration with eRA Committee (system focused)
- Potential to collaborate with many other FDP committees, working groups, faculty and federal partners

**Current Status:**

- Working to identify what would result in the most significant reduction of burden in the Federal proposal development, proposal submission and Just-In-Time stages in order to determine priorities for a potential demonstration or pilot
- Exploratory in nature currently
Some initial activities/discussions:

- SciENcv – September FDP session with NSF
- Research.gov – Engaged in discussions with NSF regarding the transition to Research.gov.
  - September 2020, gathered a small group on short notice representing 12 FDP member institutions to provide feedback via a Zoom call to NSF about the current use of the Fastlane demo site and the future possible use of a Research.gov demo site.
- Completed initial analysis of practices/requirements related to the proposal submission process from FDP member Federal agencies to identify preferred/more flexible options
**Proposal Exploratory Initiative**

- Yes/JIT Responses = more flexible/preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions structured to elicit answer YES = more flexible/preferred; JIT = more flexible/preferred</th>
<th>NSF</th>
<th>NIH</th>
<th>ONR</th>
<th>USDA</th>
<th>AFOSR</th>
<th>ARO</th>
<th>AMRMC</th>
<th>NASA</th>
<th>EPA</th>
<th>DHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad use of pre-proposals for most competitive programs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad use of rolling proposal deadlines</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some use of rolling proposal deadlines</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal submission is only through Grants.gov not agency supplemental system</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows submission of abbreviated budgets and justifications at proposal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require special budget breakdown (by task/federal fiscal year/etc)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal deadline time is 5pm local?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Current &amp; Pending/Other Support</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sciENcv</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Data management plan submission</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Human Subjects use/Clinical Trial description</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of IRB protocol submission</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Animal use description</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PROPOSAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of ACUC protocol submission</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td>JIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require submission of SFI/COI disclosures or updates</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require sponsored travel disclosures</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require OCI/ICOI disclosures</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require certifications/disclosures other than SAM</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use collaborative proposal model rather than subs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require collaborators/affiliates form submission</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Exploratory Initiative – Next Steps

- ThoughtExchange to collect more ideas/thoughts
- Compare the results of the ThoughtExchange with the flexibilities chart to identify possible areas for further exploration
- Potential to expand working group to explore further
What do you believe would result in the most significant reduction of burden in the Federal proposal development, proposal submission and Just-In-Time stages?

https://my.thoughtexchange.com/scroll/584569567
Possible Future Initiatives:

• Review ThoughtExchange results to determine next steps – identify additional volunteers to join group
• Continue to collaborate with the eRA Committee on other proposal related projects – focused on business process
• Engage with federal agencies on the possible use of more pre-proposals to limit the burden associated with full submissions
• Encourage use of “Just-In-Time” more broadly to reduce burden when only ~1/3 of proposals are awarded (reps and certs, C&P, complex budget forms, etc.)
• Understand the impact of foreign influence driven requirements on proposals
• Provide feedback to JCORE/CARR on proposal related admin burden reduction topics – stay synced up
Expanded Clearinghouse

Courtney Swaney, University of Texas Austin Subcommittee Co-Chair
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Co-Chairs
- Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University
- Denise Moody, Boston VA Research Institute
- Courtney Swaney, University of Texas, Austin

Members
- Lynette Arias, University of Washington, Senior Advisor, Emeritus Co-Chair
- Webb Brightwell, Harvard University
- Neal Hunt, Vanderbilt University
- Carrie MacCue - The Research Foundation for the State University of New York
- Robert Prentiss, Yale University
- Chris Renner, Vanderbilt University Medical Center
- Jennifer Rodis, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Julie Thatcher, Institute for Systems Biology
- Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota, Senior Advisor, Emeritus Co-Chair
Exp Clearinghouse Updates

- New co-chairs (March 1st)
- New Phase VII profiles published (37)

• Subcommittee website
  ➢ Clarification on Clearinghouse subscription fee versus FDP membership fee

- Clearinghouse systems page
- FDP Profile Participation Agreement (May 1st)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
<th># of Profiles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pilot participants – wave 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Pilot participants – wave 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pilot participants – wave 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2018</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Remaining Phase VII members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2019</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Non-FDP member participants – 1(^{st}) cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2020 – Jan 2021</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Phase VII new member profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2021</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Non-FDP member participants – 2(^{nd}) cohort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expanded Clearinghouse Timeline for Non-FDP Member Cohort

- **[March 2021]** Invited waiting list of 48 institutions; 23 accepted participation
  - Phase VII applicants but not FDP members
  - Multi-campus institutions whose main campus is a FDP member
  - Single-audit entity

- **[April 2021]** Began entering profiles

- **[May 2021]** Clearinghouse subscription fee due

- **[June 2021]** Invitations sent for 2nd wave

- **[July 1, 2021]** New profiles published for 1st wave
Future Considerations

• FDP Infrastructure Committee - Internal Systems Working Group collaboration

• Financial risk assessment questionnaire in collaboration with Subawards Subcommittee

• Continue engaging with European colleagues in developing Due Diligence/University of Kent
Open Government Research Administration Data (OG:RAD)

Subcommittee Co-Chairs
• Richard Fenger, University of Washington
• Stephanie Endy, Brown University
• Avi Tembolkar, NSF

Letter of Credit Draw-down Survey Leads
• Nate Martinez-Wayman, Duke University
• Chris Berner – NSF
Open Government Research Administration Data (thefdp.org\...)

Highlights:

- **Purpose:** Evidence, community, partners
- **Structure:** Workgroups and **Community of Practice** – Admin Data

**Standing Group:** Data Analysis and Business Intelligence Community of Practice

Work with folks to demo local data solutions like dashboards and key metrics from our partner institutions. Open call for participants. Contact us and let’s make sure you are able to demonstrate your data wares!

**Membership:** TBD - Expected to be based on New FDP volunteer interest feedback and any data enthusiasts

- **Special:** Letter of Credit Draw-downs to Distributed Ledger Technology Proof of Concept section. Currently a workgroup in the FDP Finance and Accounting Committee

**NSF & Treasury DLT Clickable Prototype:**

- Zoom Demo via youtube
- Presentation PDF
- **Clickable demo** (pwd: fit_gps)
Previous Era: performance.gov

Key Drivers of Transformation

- IT Modernization (CAP Goal 1)
- Data, Accountability, and Transparency (CAP Goal 2)
- People - Workforce of the Future (CAP Goal 3)

Cross-Cutting Priority Areas for Transformation
- Improving Customer Experience (CAP Goal 4)
- Sharing Quality Services (CAP Goal 5)
- Shifting From Low-Value to High-Value Work (CAP Goal 6)

Functional Priority Areas for Transformation
- Category Management (CAP Goal 7)
- Results-Oriented Accountability for Grants (CAP Goal 8)
- Getting Payments Right (CAP Goal 9)
- Federal IT Spending Transparency (CAP Goal 10)
- Improve Management of Major Acquisitions (CAP Goal 11)
Current Moment: performance.gov

Looking for information on a past administration's performance and management agendas? Trump archive | Obama archive | Bush archive

COMING SOON

The President's Management Agenda

The President's Management Agenda represents the federal government's reform plan. It establishes a long-term vision for an effective government that works on behalf of the American people with key performance and management priorities designed to improve results.
QSMO is up and running

In the meantime, 1:

FORMALLY DESIGNATED
Grants Management

QSMO Agency: HHS
Services: Grant Program Administration and Oversight, Management of Grant Pre-Award, Award, Post-Award & Closeout, Grant Recipient Oversight (initial focus may be a Single Audit Solution)
Website: hhs.gov/about/agencies/asfr/grants-management-quality-services-management-office/index.html
Contact: GrantsQSMO@hhs.gov
In the meantime, 2:

Monitoring Modernization Efforts:
- MITRE
- DLT PoC (Treasury and NSF)
- FIBF
- SNoA - critical data elements and a step towards automation?
- USASpending.gov - dev continues
- Regulations, Legislation, Memos

Current Work:
- Burden Measures & Reduction (Draw-downs/LoC)
- Various modernization efforts (Blockchain, DLT)
- Cap Goal 8 – Grants Management Quality Service Management Organizations (QSMO) – via HHS
- FSRS Survey and Partnership
- HERD
- Systems Matrix Analysis (eRA+)
Post Award Management Draw-downs (LoC): Quantifying workload associated with post award management, specifically grant drawdowns. In this project grant recipients will quantify the specific workload by FTE of preparing for drawdowns, drawing funds, and reconciling the funds from the existing institution accounting systems with the Federal Government drawdown systems. Attention will also be given to the number of different drawdown systems used by the FDP members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OG:RAD</th>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received</td>
<td>62 responses; representative of all FDP members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>5 draw systems: ACM$, ASAP, G5, GPRS, PMS (now 4 with the retirement of GPRS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Points of interest to explore | How workload correlates to institutional volume  
How workload correlates to number of systems used  
How workload correlates to developed institutional tools  
Potential improvements     |
| Final Findings & Recommendations | 6/15/2021                                                  |
Findings:
• Respondent profiles 10

• Question 1a - Frequency 10

• Question 1b - # of Awards 12

• Question 2 - Familiarity 16

Respondents:

Frequency & Volume:
54% of the participants drew on the LoC Systems multiple times a month and 46% drew monthly or greater.

The results show that PMS and ACM$ both have the largest number of awards. ASAP was a distant third followed by G5 and GPRS.

Familiarity:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACM$</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRS</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Somewhat Familiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:
• System experiences 17
  • Question 3 - Ease of use 17
  • Question 4 - Difficulty to view 17
  • Question 5 - Difficulty to understand 18
  • Question 6 - Availability 19
  • Question 7 - Customer Support 20

All five systems are available at least 71% of the time to the respondents, though respondents report that ASAP is not as available as the other systems.

Support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACM$</th>
<th>ASAP</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>GPRS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven’t had to contact customer support</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Responses</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

• Quantifying the process 22

• Question 8 - # of Staff 22

• Question 9 - Number of Hours 25

Process:

Number of Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of people</th>
<th>% Gtot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Responses: 100%

Prep

Submission

Reconciliation

Hours

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-draw actions (reconciling, etc)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:
• Quantifying the process 22
• Question 10 - # of FTEs 29

Process:
Findings:

- Quantifying the process 22

- Question 16 - Agency review duration 31

- Question 17 - Agency confirmation 32

- Question 18 - Avg Time to receive funds 33

Process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACM$</th>
<th>ASAP</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>GPRS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACM$</th>
<th>ASAP</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>GPRS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In system</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACM$</th>
<th>ASAP</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>GPRS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

• Finding for opportunities for efficiencies 35

• Question 11 - Additional Tools 35

• Question 12 - Upload or manual key-in 36

• Question 15 - Supporting Docs Required 37

Opportunities:
Findings:

• Section II Data Manipulation 38
• Qualitative Analysis 39
  • Question 13 - Best features 39

• Question 14 - Worst features 39

• Question 19 - Process improvement 39

Section II - Qualitative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Manipulation</th>
<th>48%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 – System features every system should adopt
- Ability for system to allow for uploading data, exporting data, use an API (30)
- Ability to return funds, have negative draw amounts, and return funds on closed accounts (20)
- Inclusion of all relevant information when doing draws (19)
- Common and robust set of queries and reports (9)
- Elimination of need for quarterly FFR reporting (8)

Q14 – System features needing improvement
- Improvements to data displayed and reporting (20)
- Improve/allow for data uploads/downloads (9)
- Improvements to user interface (7)
- Improvements to timeout and notifications (7)
- Allowance for book entry adjustments and refunds (6)

Q19 - Suggestions for improvements to the drawdown process
- Ability to upload/download files (14)
- Ability to allow for negative draws, book entry adjustments, refunds (8)
- Improvements to notifications, especially when drawdowns have issues (7)
- Increase time before session times out; allow for saving of partially complete draw (7)
- Eliminate requirement for quarterly FFR reporting (6)
Findings:

- Analysis 41
- Recommendations 42
- Conclusion
- Acknowledgement – Vols! THANK YOU!

Survey Creation

- Bryan Van Sickle, University of Michigan
- Deena Pinoe, Tufts University
- Erin Wallett, University of Kentucky
- Heather Nelson, University of Idaho
- James Ringo, UC Davis
- Jim Becker, Indiana University
- Julie Luster, Princeton University
- Manuela Dokie, UTEP
- Marlene Erno, Wayne State University
- Paige Brown, University of Kentucky
- Robert Prentiss, University of Texas
- Robin Murphy, Oregon Health and Science University
- Sarah Cody, Texas Tech University
- Victoria Briscoe, UTHealth

Survey Analysis

- James Ringo, UC Davis
- Sarah Cody, Texas Tech University
- Heather Nelson, University of Idaho
- Manuela Dokie, UTEP
- Marlene Erno, Wayne State University
- Paul Gasior, John Hopkins
- Anthony Tosheff, John Hopkins
- Gloria Greene, University of Alabama Huntsville
- Adam Mall, University of Michigan
- Afton Berger, Texas A&M University
- Ben Holyomes, Stanford University
- Crystal Foy, Texas A&M University
- Mario Reina-Guerra, UC Davis
- Rosemary Madnick, University of Alaska
- Tim Reuter, Stanford University
- Jonathan Wong, UCLA
- Valarie King, University of Alabama Huntsville
- Bryan Van Sickle, University of Michigan
OG:RAD – LoC to DLT PoC

MITRE Grant Life-cycle and the LoC
OG:RAD – LoC to DLT PoC

MITRE Grant Life-cycle
High Level Current State Grants Payments Flow

Today, the grant payments flow comprises of the Department of the Treasury, the awarding agency, and the prime and sub recipients. Certified payments are only sent to the prime and they manage payments to the subs independently.

Certified payments are released to the prime recipient who then sends funds to sub-recipients.

Current Process:
1. Federal Grant-Making Agencies (e.g. NSF) send grant payment information to the payment drawdown system
2. Prime recipient/grantee requests a drawdown from the payment drawdown system
3. Once Certifying Official certifies payment, the funds are released from the Treasury General Account via automated clearing house (ACH)
4. The sub-recipient(s) requests a drawdown from the prime recipient
5. Once prime recipient approves payment, the funds are released to sub-recipients via automated clearing house (ACH)
Detailed Current State Grants Payments Flow

The end-to-end flow of grant payments today from NSF’s perspective includes manual processes, substantial administrative and reporting burden, and a lack of visibility between actors. Highlighted boxes are further detailed on the subsequent slides.
OG:RAD - Housekeeping

- OG:RAD Webpage
- Listserv: fdp-open-gvmnt-l@lsw.nas.edu
Proposal Initiative – ThoughtExchange

- Brief sharing of Proposal Exploratory Initiative ThoughtExchange

- Feel free to continue to add more thoughts and ratings.

- We will send information out to group in the coming weeks with more information about next steps.
Session Wrap up / Next steps

● **Focus over summer**
  ○ Identify Federal Co-chair or liaisons
  ○ Engaging additional federal agency partners
  ○ Enhancing our engagement with faculty
  ○ Fill out our Committee, subcommittees & working groups

● **Continued assessment of priorities for Phase VII**
  ○ Utilizing results and recommendations from 2018 Faculty Workload Survey
  ○ Staying in sync with broad federal agency priorities and projects - OMB, OSTP, QSMO, etc
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Subcommittee/Working Group</th>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Direction &amp; Oversight</td>
<td>Lynette Arias, University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD, Federal Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Subcommittee</td>
<td>Melissa Korf, Harvard Medical School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisabeth Peloso, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Mayo, Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subawards Subcommittee</td>
<td>Amanda Humphrey, Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Ritchie, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Clearinghouse Subcommittee</td>
<td>Courtney Swaney, University of Texas Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Moody. Boston VA Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Government: Research Administration Data</td>
<td>Richard Fenger, University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avinash Tembulkar, NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Endy, Brown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Exploratory Initiative</td>
<td>Amanda Hamaker, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Gray, University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Mosley, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Schultz, University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Administrator Collaboration Team (FACT)</td>
<td>Suzanne Alstadt, UAMS [admin co-chair]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Post, UAMS [faculty co-chair]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-large members</td>
<td>Stephanie Scott, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Webb, University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-Chair Contact Info

• Lynette Arias
  • University of Washington
  • ariasl@uw.edu

Research Administration Committee Webpage

• http://thefdp.org/default/committees/research-administration/FDP Clearinghouse web-based system
Next FDP Session

eRA - SAM.gov and UEI Update

1:00pm ET / 10:00am PT

thefdp.org/