



Federal Demonstration Partnership

Redefining the Government University Research Partnership

March 17, 2008

Dear Colleagues,

The **Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP)** meeting was held at The National Academy of Sciences on January 10-11, 2008. The FDP is a cooperative initiative among 11 federal agencies and 96 institutional recipients of federal funds. The purpose of the FDP is to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants and contracts. The FDP has three annual meetings where interaction between FDP's 300 or so university and federal members takes place. In addition, many collaborative working groups and task forces have meetings by conference calls in order to develop specific work products. The FDP is a unique forum for individuals from universities and nonprofits to work collaboratively with federal agency officials to improve the national research enterprise. At its regular meetings, FDP members hold spirited, frank discussions, identify problems, and develop action plans for change. Then, these new ways of doing business are tested in a "real world" demonstration before putting them into actual practice.

<name> (email) is the Administrative Representative and <name> (email) is the Faculty Representative to the FDP for <your Institution Name>.

Immediately below is a short list of **Highlights of the January, 2008 FDP Meeting**, followed by a **Brief History of the FDP**, followed by the **Initiatives for FDP Phase IV**. If you wish additional information about the FDP and/or its initiatives, please contact your Administrative and/or Faculty Representative or visit the FDP website, www.thefdp.org. The next meeting of the FDP is May 15-16, 2008 at the Hyatt Fair Lakes in Virginia.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE JANUARY, 2008 FDP MEETING

The agenda and presentations for the main meeting can be found at http://www.thefdp.org/May_2007_meeting.html.

Phase V Transition Information

Joanna Rom, NSF, gave the FDP Representatives an update on the progress being made towards the upcoming transition to Phase V (http://thefdp.org/Present_1_Jan_2008.pdf). The 4 slides accompanying Joanna's presentation are pretty self-explanatory and you are encouraged to read them for further information. More details are discussed in the section reviewing the Faculty Lunch Forum.

Plenary – Federal Agency Updates

In the NIH update (http://thefdp.org/Present_2_Jan_2008.pdf) Joe Ellis spoke about the Public Access Policy that will require investigators to submit their final peer-reviewed manuscripts that result from NIH-sponsored research to PubMed Central at the National Library of Medicine within 12 months of publication. Joe also indicated that Public Law 110-85 has been enacted to expand the scope of ClinicalTrials.gov. Guidance on what this means can be located at:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-014.html> and
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-023.html>

The OMB has approved slight changes to PHS398 and PHS2590 to bring them more into line with SF424 (R&R) and as announced in <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-031.html> all appendix material on or after May 25th can only be submitted on CD. Finally, effective February 5, 2008, NIH will be implementing continuous submission for appointed members of chartered, standing, NIH Study Sections. This applies to R01, R21 and R34 applications. In the case of multiple PIs, the new policy applies so long as one of them is an appointed member of a chartered study section. More information can be located at:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-026.html>
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-027.html>

Jean Feldman, NSF, gave a very detailed update on recent activities at the National Science Foundation that can be reviewed by clicking on the link: http://thefdp.org/Present_3_Jan_2008.pdf. Briefly Jean covered the topics of Transformative Research, the America Competes Act and Research.gov. The National Science Board (Board) unanimously approved a motion by National Science Foundation (NSF) Director Arden L. Bement, Jr. to enhance support of transformative research at the NSF. Additionally, Dr Bement proposed -- and the Board adopted -- a change to the intellectual merit review criterion to specifically include evaluation of proposals for potentially transformative concepts. In response to the America Competes Act, NSF has set up 5 Internal Working Groups that will address the following areas:

- Budget
- Major Research Equipment & Facilities Construction
- Education & Human Resources
- Computer & Information Science & Engineering/Cyber Infrastructure
- Policy

The Research.gov web portal for PIs and SPOs is progressing well and presently contains a policy library, research spending and results, and research headlines. In the spring they are hoping to add a grant

application status function. Presently, USDA/CSREES is partnering with NSF in this endeavor but negotiations are in process to bring NASA and DoD Research Agencies.

Jean Feldman, NSF, also gave an update (http://thefdp.org/Present_4_Jan_2008.pdf) on the implementation of research terms and conditions.

Kathy Wetherell, AFOSR, gave an update (http://thefdp.org/Present_5_Jan_2008.pdf) that included an introduction of staff in her office, changes occurring in AFMC FARS and changes to the AFRL Terms and Conditions. Kathy also covered a few hot topics that included cash on hand concerns as well as no cost extensions.

Rich Bissell, GUIRR, gave an update on finding a successor to Merrilea Mayo, who left GUIRR in November, 2007, to work at the Kauffman Foundation. Rich indicated that a number of applications had been received and that an interview process was about to begin. He was hoping to have a successor to Merrilea by the May meeting.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 1

DoD 35% F&A Cap Debbie Rafi (Office of Naval Research) discussed the new limitation on indirect cost recovery on Department of Defense (DoD) Basic Research Grants laid out in the DoD Appropriations Act, 2008 (http://thefdp.org/Present_6_Jan_2008.pdf). This is a complex issue that is not easily summarized in a few words and those interested in more details are encouraged to read through the slides, which also contain an example of what this new practice will mean at the University level.

Audit – A-133 Demonstration James Becker of Indiana University and Lynn Johnson of Colorado State University gave an update (http://thefdp.org/Present_7_Jan_2008.pdf) on the A-133 pilot demonstration. They reviewed the data that had already been uploaded into the web-based database and asked for more institutions to post their audit data. They also discussed the continuing development of FDP templates for sub-recipient monitoring.

ERA – Security and Credentials Steve Gillis of the Office of Naval Research described (http://thefdp.org/Present_9_Jan_2008.pdf) various approaches that had been, or were being, looked at for encryption of data. Focus was on sensitive but unclassified data, personal information, and on data “at rest” (i.e. not transmission) on portable devices such as memory sticks, CDs/DVDs, laptops and Blackberries to name a few.

Peter Alterman (NIH) described http://thefdp.org/Present_10_Jan_2008.pdf efforts at “interfederation” of electronic credentials across institutions with each institution able to recognize and accept the identity of individuals entering e-systems from other institutions within the federation. Among the possible outcomes envisioned were that faculty would be able to log into the NIH Commons using a University ID and system, rather than needing to use an NIH username and password.

Faculty Lunch Forum

Norka Ruiz-Bravo, NIH, was going to continue the on going discussion regarding the public opinion of animal use in scientific research. Unfortunately, Norka was unable to attend due to a last minute conflict and so Sara Rockwell, Yale, and David Robinson, OHSU, lead a general discussion relating to items of interest

to the Faculty Representatives. Sara started out by asking for new members to introduce themselves and then highlighted specific sessions that she felt would be of particular interest to Faculty. Sara called for volunteers to attend specific sessions and asked them to report back at the final Faculty Session the following morning. Sara gave an update on the Faculty Burden survey indicating that copies had been mailed out to the Co-Chairs of the Committee on Science (Sharon Hays, Arden Bement and Elias Zerhouni) and more copies would be mailed to entities such as the AAU, AMC, AAAS, FASEB, OSTP and OMB, and several other professional societies.

David updated the Faculty Representatives on the plans for the September meeting (9/7 – 9/9), which will occur at the Ritz Carlton on Amelia Island, Fl. The September meeting will be a celebration of 20 years of the FDP as well as the first meeting of Phase V. David indicated that while there would be some celebratory and reflective sessions this would still be a working meeting and asked that the Faculty start thinking about Agenda items for this meeting and email them to him and Sara by mid-March. David also indicated that the Agenda for the January meeting had been difficult to organize and the FDP Executive Committee was eager to have the May Agenda organized much earlier. If the Faculty had ideas for the May Agenda, David asked them to email Sara and him also by mid-March.

David then updated the Faculty Representatives on the Transition Plans being developed and some organizational information for 2009. In 2009 the National Academies building will be unavailable due to construction and so the FDP meetings in January (1/12 – 1/13) and September (9/10 – 9/11) of 2009 will occur in a yet to be determined hotel in the Washington DC area. The present plan was to hold the May (5/14 – 5/15) meeting on the West Coast probably in Irvine, California.

In February, the Phase V Solicitation will be published in the Federal Register and Institutions will have until April 1 to submit their applications. The membership committee will then review the applications and all Phase V members will be notified sufficiently ahead of the May meeting to permit them to arrange to be in attendance. While all Phase IV members are expected to be there, this represents an important introduction meeting for new Phase V members who have not participated in the FDP in the past. David also announced that all existing Federal Agencies had agreed to be members in Phase V and negotiations were taking place with other Agencies to bring them on board. A final list of VIP invitees was being developed for the September meeting and the hope was to have the agenda for that meeting finalized mid-summer.

Finally, David asked for people who are interested in running for Faculty Co-Chair of the FDP in Phase V to indicate their interest to Sara before the May meeting. Sara will not be running for a second term of office, however, David did indicate his interest in being considered. David did point out that in Phase V the position would be for a 3 year term rather than the 2 year terms typical of past phases. The decision to go to 3 years had been made to ensure more continuity and better stability in the leadership of the FDP although the Executive Committee did recognize that it might be harder to find candidates willing to make such a commitment.

Admin Lunch Forum 1 – America Competes Act

Jean Feldman chaired a session to explain the steps the NSF is taking to comply with the America Competes Act (ACA). Jean pointed out that ACA has specific language requiring the NSF to develop new programs and requirements for research grantees, with specific language “within 6 months.” Jean asked the FDP reps to tell their faculty that any new requirements are not yet in effect. The language of the ACA gives the NSF

very broad flexibility in defining elements of the plan. To do this, NSF has formed 5 internal working groups thus tapping its own in-house expertise on:

- Budget
- Management of research equipment & facility construction
- Education & human resources
- Computer and information science and engineering
- Policy

Sections of the ACA that require specific actions include:

Section 7008 Postdoctoral Research Fellows

The ACA requires PIs to describe, in the research proposal, a plan to mentor postdocs in professional development and to report what was actually done in annual and final progress reports. NSF is developing goals for this section and thus far indicates the working committee does not want a check box for a program organized by central admin or other central group. Websites are to be avoided due to issues of confidentiality and security. As of now, fulfilling the ACA will be very burdensome for PIs if university RCR programs (such as CWRU's) will be deemed unacceptable. Right now, it is felt that 'describe a plan' is unlikely to happen.

NSF will not take the NIH approach because it applies only to training grants. NSF working groups need more information on the types of programs organized and provided by institutions/academic centers (for example, the Postdoctoral Skills Program at CASE SOM for all postdocs regardless of source of salary support). FDP reps pointed out that university central administrations should take the responsibility to provide these programs (see also next section on RCR).

SECTION 7009 Responsible conduct of research

PIs are required to describe a plan to teach RCR. NSF implied that current RCR training in compliance with the NIH will not be accepted. RCR will apply to all trainees from undergraduates to postdocs. There were many questions about undergraduates because of the varying levels of participation in research. NSF is gathering information on RCR because it has no idea what institutions are doing or requiring now. A number of FDP faculty and several administrators provided information about CITI.EDU plus other resources; Jean says the NSF needs this type of information. NSF may approach FDP institutions for information on courses and/or websites used for the training. FDP Faculty Representatives are very concerned because of a possible requirement for RCR that duplicates training accepted by the NIH. Some institutions require all faculty and trainees to take complete RCR training (animals, human subject, animal, etc), others require selected training depending on the research projects. FDP faculty requested a survey of FDP institutions and faculty for the type and number of hours of RCR training and retraining required of faculty and trainees. Jean suggested that the NSF may set up website of resources based on the information received from institutions. NSF has an Ethics educator and AAS fellows working on this section; COGR has agreed to help. There may be a workshop to get input from the community.

FDP reps pointed out that university central administrations should, and do, take the responsibility to provide RCR training.

SECTION 7010 Reporting of research results

ACA states progress reports and citations of published research must be made available to the public domain. Several issues are identified: final reports have personal identifier data so are not suitable for the public domain. The annual reports are considered a communication between the PI and program officer so

are not be suitable for the public domain. Release of unpublished data to public can lead to misinterpretation of the findings. These problems are known and recognized by working groups, so new ideas are needed.

SECTION 7014 Cost sharing

ACA requires 30% cost sharing except for non-PhD granting institutions. Concern here is loss of industry support and involvement in academic research. More on this later.

SECTION 7021 Pilot program for grants for new investigators

NSF has specific programs for new investigators, yet ACA requires a new program and defined eligibility of new investigator as PI with no previous NSF grant and a rating of 'excellent' on a grant to the NSF. The purpose of the program is to improve the rating of the grant. NSF will go back the committee on the Hill about their intent because there is better rating than 'excellent' on a grant to the NSF.

SECTION 7023 Major research instrumentation

ACA adds back funds to cover costs of operations and maintenance, so this is better for institutions.

FDP Faculty Representatives are very concerned about two of the sections and will very likely provide input to the working groups.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 2

ERA – Grants.gov Michael Pellegrino and the rest of the Grants.gov team gave an update on their activities since the last meeting (http://thefdp.org/Present_12_Jan_2008.pdf). They concentrated on giving updates on the back-end systems, the schedule for the transition from PureEdge to Adobe, tracking of an application after submission, Vista and Leopard compatibility with Grants.gov, and system-to-system issues. They also discussed a list of topics that had been raised by the FDP and what measures had been taken to address them. A great deal of concern was voiced by those present regarding the readiness of the Adobe system as well as funding agencies to move from PureEdge to Adobe. There is a long list of outstanding issues that need to be resolved by June 30, which is the present date when all new applications must be submitted through the new Adobe system. Indeed NIH voiced concerns about the aggressive timescale and their ability to meet it should initial beta-tests not go smoothly.

Another issue that came to light was the ultimate dependency of the new Adobe system on specific versions of Adobe software. In particular, the Adobe Forms downloaded from Grants.gov should only be opened in Adobe Acrobat Reader 8.1.1 or later. Forms opened in earlier versions of Acrobat Reader or any version of Adobe Acrobat Professional corrupts the underlying data structure preventing a successful upload to Grants.gov. This corruption is invisible to the preparer until the time at which it is submitted and the only recourse is to start with a brand new set of forms and recreate a whole new application. With grants frequently passing through a number of hands within an institution, the general thought was that this software version dependency was unacceptable. The Grants.gov team did announce that Adobe had agreed to make sure that future releases of their Reader software would be compatible with Grants.gov for at least the next year.

Deemed Export Advisory Committee (DEAC) Report - Bob Hardy from the Council on Government Relations (COGR) and Toby Smith from the AAU led a discussion (http://thefdp.org/Present_13_Jan_2008.pdf) on the DEAC Report (which can be downloaded

from <http://tac.bis.doc.gov/2007/deacreport.pdf>. The COGR/AAU recommendations to the DEAC report can also be downloaded at http://www.aau.edu/research/Stmt_AAU-COGR_DEAC_9-10-07.pdf. It was clearly noted that the Faculty Standing Committee (FSC) is encouraged to become actively engaged in the continuing discussions of the issues associated with the DEAC report. A 32-page Executive Summary was cited as the key document to be reviewed by the FSC. Some sample issues with the DEAC Report include:

- Modification in the definition of Fundamental Research
- Potential for increased research considered “classified”
- Does not fix issues associated with VISA problems
- Definition of “trusted entities”

The session concluded with an invitation for volunteers, especially from the FSC to work on addressing the findings and recommendations of the DEAC Report.

Open Discussion about How to Best Collect Information about PIs Wally Shaffer (NIH) described new congressional mandates to collect more information on NIH-supported “Trainees”. The definition of “trainee” now includes (per Congress) postdoctoral “trainees” who are supported by NIH research grants in addition to those on training grants. This latter group of “trainees” is currently defined by NIH as employees, who are employed to perform research on the project, rather than trainees.

The goal is to collect data in a permanent database and to track trainees throughout their careers. The data elements to be collected include many personal elements that are not part of the standard biosketch (e.g. full or partial social security number, gender, disabilities). This process is still early in the conceptualization phase and the questions explored in the session included who should enter the data and who should be responsible for updating it throughout the remainder of the trainee’s career.

The Faculty should participate in these discussions going forwards, as this could be a valuable data source, but could also be an additional repetitive administrative burden to update.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 3

ERA – ERA Agency Matrix Wiki Steve Dowdy and Amy Holden of MIT, Bob Beattie of the University of Michigan and Kristie Froman from Harvard University presented work they had done to collect ERA related information in a Wiki and present it by Federal Agency. The hope is that the Wiki will provide a consistent and up to date resource for institutions to check to see if any issues they are having have been addressed or whether there are workarounds that can be employed to ease the grant submission process. The Wiki can be located by clicking on “ERA Sponsor Matrix” at the bottom of the FDP home page or by clicking on <http://wiki.research.colostate.edu/>. More information on this project can be found in the following two presentations:

http://thefdp.org/Present_14_Jan_2008.pdf

http://thefdp.org/Present_15_Jan_2008.pdf

ERA DUNS-CCR Registration Earl Warrington of the General Services Administration (GSA) Office of Acquisitions Integrated Acquisitions Division gave a presentation on updates made to Central Contractor Registration system (http://thefdp.org/Present_11_Jan_2008.pdf). An item of particular interest to the faculty arose in the question and answer session that followed Earl’s

presentation. This item related to the need for Study Section members to go through the particularly time consuming process of registering in the CCR in order to receive reimbursement, and the subsequently large quantity of email this generates as entities contact Faculty thinking that they are companies with contractual relations with the Federal Government. Earl was not aware of this problem.

Contracts Alexandra McKeown from Johns Hopkins University, Carol Zuiches from the University of Washington and Rosemary Hamill from NIH led a discussion related to contracting. Further information is not available at this time.

Trans-NIH and Trans-Federal Biosafety Activities Sally Rockey and Amy Patterson of NIH described (http://thefdp.org/Present_8_Jan_2008.pdf) a new mandate to NIH to have oversight of Biosafety activities related to research be broadened to an oversight process that spans all Federal Agencies. The goal is to eliminate differences in agency requirements and procedures and to eliminate inter-agency gaps in oversight. The process should have the obvious advantage of improving oversight of Biosafety by harmonizing requirements and processes across agencies should have additional advantages to investigators and institutions.

Areas to watch:

- Possibility of credentialing individuals
- Possibility of requiring institutional accreditation (citing animals and human subjects as models)
- Interface with requirements related to bio-security, deemed exports etc.
- Possible changes in roles and responsibilities of IBC.

Faculty should participate in this process and volunteers who are willing to get involved should email Sara Rockwell or David Robinson.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 4

Reducing Faculty and Administrative Burden in the Grant Budgeting Process David Robinson, OHSU, moderated a panel discussion regarding different practices employed by varying Universities related to the amount of budget detailed required at the time of grant submission. The panelists included: Don Denson (Emory), Joe Konstan and Pamela Web (University of Minnesota); Asuman Kiyak and Sinh Simmons (University of Washington).

ERA – FFATA Andrea L. Brandon, USDA/CSREES, lead a discussion on the FDP Sub-award pilot. Further information is not available at this time.

Terms & Conditions Mike Ludwig, Purdue University and Jean Feldman, NSF Further information is not available at this time.

Committee and Task Force – Concurrent Session 5

Subawards Susan Boone (University of Chicago) and George Gardner (NIH) led a discussion on fixed price and other types of agreements when issuing subawards to foreign entities. David Brady (Virginia Tech) gave a presentation (http://thefdp.org/Present_19_Jan_2008.pdf) on this subject. His presentation concentrated on whether the international sub-recipient is eligible for financial

assistance, procurement alternatives, choosing a procurement instrument, payment structure issues, audit issues and the pros and cons associated with different contract types.

Faculty Standing Committee Sara Rockwell (Yale) and David Robinson (OHSU) lead a review of the meeting, summarizing the key points that were addressed in the sessions that they had attended. John Mason (Penn State) gave a review of the Deemed Export session; Asuman Kiyak gave a review of the Foreign Sub-awards session; and Carol Liedtke (Case Western Reserve) and Don Denson (Emory) gave a review of the NSF response to the America Competes Act. This document relies heavily on the reports given by these Faculty Representatives and Sara and David would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their efforts. The general feedback at the end of this session was that the Faculty Representatives found it very informative to have such a review and were supportive of adopting a similar format in the future. Sara and David will work with the Executive Committee to try to arrange a similar schedule in future meetings.

ERA – NSF’s GMLoB Consortium: Research.gov Update David Saunders, Kim Deutsch, Stacie Boyd of NSF and Rick Howington of USDA discussed Research.gov which is being developed to streamline the research community’s access to grants information and provide services for multiple Federal Agencies (http://thefdp.org/Present_16_Jan_2008.pdf). The presentation began with a description of what the goals of Research.gov are, which was followed by describing its benefits to the research community, and initial feedback from the pilot study conducted in the Fall. This was then followed by a description of the services offerings and features found on research.gov and future functionality that is being considered. The slides accompanying the presentation contain a lot of useful information and Faculty are encouraged to look through them as well as visit the website located at <http://www.research.gov>.

Plenary – NIH Review Program Updates

Tony Scarpa, M.D. PhD., NIH Director of CSR gave an update on changes that are being implemented or are being considered in the peer review process (http://thefdp.org/Present_17_Jan_2008.pdf). Last year NIH received 77,000 applications of which 51,000 were reviewed by 16,000 reviewers in approximately 1,800 review meetings. The peer review process is struggling to meet the growing number of grant applications and significant changes need to be made to ensure continued success in this important process. Over the past year, CSR has been reviewing these processes and have gathered input from a variety of sources to determine what needs the most attention. After analyzing the data they gathered CSR have decided to adopt a process that will address issues in the following areas: Changes in CSR Operations; and Improving Peer Review Process. The slides that accompanied his presentation contain a great deal of information regarding the data they gathered and some of the changes already implemented along with some of the changes that are being considered. Faculty are encouraged to read over these slides as they contain some very interesting information and concepts.

Lawrence Tabak, DDS, PhD, from NIH followed with a more detailed description of the self-study carried out by the NIH in partnership with the scientific community to determine how best to strengthen the peer review process (http://thefdp.org/Present_18_Jan_2008.pdf). Dr Tabak described the processes adopted to gather data for this self-study and discussed in quite some detail the emerging themes they found. Dr Tabak also discussed some of the suggested solutions that are being considered that address the major issues that were identified in the self-study. The slides that accompanied his presentation are self explanatory and very rich in information and Faculty are encouraged to read through them as some of the proposed solutions are extremely revolutionary and could significantly change the peer review process at NIH.

Brief History of the FDP

In 1985, the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR) convened pre-FDP hearings on “Reducing Bureaucratic Accretion” in government and university sponsored research systems.

In 1986, the FDP (**Florida Demonstration Project**) was created to develop and test new grants management procedures. Founding members were five major federal research and development agencies (NSF, NIH, ONR, DOE, and USDA), the Florida State University System, and the University of Miami.

In 1988, the FDP was expanded through a competitive process to include 45 institutions in 14 states and 10 federal agencies and renamed the **Federal Demonstration Project, Phase II**.

Highlights of FDP Phases I and II

- Implemented mostly common, streamlined terms and conditions for research grants
- Increased budget flexibility
- No cost time extensions
- Pre-award costs
- Carry-forward across continuation years
- Technical progress reports/minimal continuation proposals
- Revised OMB A-110

In 1996, the FDP was designated the **Federal Demonstration Partnership, Phase III** and membership was broadened to include an additional 20 institutions, one federal agency, and seven professional associations. During this time faculty participation was increased dramatically.

Highlights of FDP Phase III

- Renewing the Government-University Partnership
- Introduction of Faculty and Program Officers as FDP members
- Electronic Research Administration
- Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting
- Award Terms and Conditions
- Sub awards

In 2002, the **Federal Demonstration Partnership, Phase IV** was initiated and includes 90 institutional recipients of federal funds (many with multiple campuses), 7 emerging research universities, 10 federal agencies, and a number of affiliate members and associations. Efforts are being undertaken to increase the participation of minority serving institutions and emerging research institutions. During the past few years, the activities of the faculty representatives have become more focused and more closely interwoven into the efforts of the FDP. In addition, more federal auditors and costing officials are involved in task forces and committees working to reduce administrative burdens.

Highlights of FDP Phase IV (to date)

- Illustrating the relationship and trade-offs among regulatory burden, research productivity, and administrative support

- Monitoring compliance issues including visa processing for foreign scholars and students, “sensitive but unclassified” information dissemination, and streamlining processes involving select agents
- Supporting the goals of the National Science and Technology Council’s (NSTC) Research Business Models (RBM) Subcommittee activities to address important policy implications arising from the changing nature of scientific research, and examine the effects of these changes on business models for the conduct of scientific research sponsored by the Federal government
- Supporting the President’s Management Agenda, specifically e-Government initiatives
- Identifying ways to broaden the participation of underrepresented populations in sponsored research, including outreach to minority serving institutions
- Recommending ways to streamline the audit requirements for universities working with other universities as sub recipients

FDP’s Current Focus

- Exploring ways to change the focus from accounting processes to accountability by making administrative requirements simpler and less costly
- Bringing research grants into the age of electronic commerce by providing input and supporting the development of a single electronic interface between government and the research community
- Increasing the focus on faculty initiated initiatives, primarily principal investigator administrative burden issues