

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

Executive Committee

Members. Barbara E. Siegel (Chair), Northwestern University; Constance Atwell (Federal Program Representative), National Institutes of Health; Wendy Baldwin (Senior Science Official), National Institutes of Health; Denise Clark (Co-Chair, ERA Standing Committee), Cornell University; Robert Hardy (Co-Chair, Membership Standing Committee), National Science Foundation; Thomas Moss (GUIRR Representative), National Academy of Sciences; Susan Braunhut (Faculty Representative), University of Massachusetts at Lowell; Charles Paoletti (Federal Administrative Representative), Office of Naval Research; Sarah Wasserman (Co-Chair, Terms and Conditions Standing Committee), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Mission. The Executive Committee is empowered to take necessary actions on behalf of the FDP membership. It develops meeting agendas, monitors task group progress, identifies opportunities for new demonstrations and acts as liaison for the FDP with other groups and individuals. The Executive Committee is reappointed every two years, and the Membership Standing Committee serves as the Nominating Committee for this purpose. The Chair and faculty representative are elected, the agency program and administrative representatives are appointed by the participating agencies, and the senior science official is appointed by the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). The Executive Committee then chooses a representative from each of the FDP standing committees to serve on the Executive Committee. Members of the Executive Committee serve as the primary point of contact/advocate for a particular constituency within the FDP (e.g., the Faculty Representative is responsible for encouraging/fostering the participation of faculty members).

Focus in the Next Year. The Executive Committee's efforts will be devoted to the design of the next phase of the FDP, whose working title is FDP IV.

Standing Committees

Membership Committee

Co-Chairs. Robert Hardy, National Science Foundation; Beth Israel, Columbia University

Mission. The committee is responsible for:

- Membership issues
- Monitoring attendance
- Assuring that vendor participation complies with FDP policy
- Receiving, evaluating and recommending requests for additional affiliate membership
- Assisting the Executive Committee with transition planning for new FDP phases
- Executive Committee nomination/election procedures

Major Accomplishments. The committee:

- Worked with the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to develop a letter from the President's Science Advisor to non-FDP science agencies encouraging them to become members of FDP as part of the Presidential Review Directive (PRD)-4 implementation.
- Followed up with non-member federal agencies as appropriate.
- Oversaw election of new FDP Chair and Faculty Representative.
- Monitored institutional attendance at FDP meetings in accordance with terms of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), identifying problems and taking appropriate follow-up action as necessary.
- Approved membership request of new affiliate member, Association of Independent Research Institutes (AIRI).
- Initiated preliminary Phase IV planning process in conjunction with the Executive Committee.

Focus in the Next Year. To develop standards and guidelines for membership in FDP IV, to encourage participation of non-FDP agencies, and to design, implement, and evaluate institutional biennial reports.

Terms and Conditions

Co-Chairs. Ann Stuart, Office of Naval Research; Sarah Wasserman, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Mission. The committee's responsibilities are to:

- Update the Appendices to FDP Operating Procedures as needed. [Flow-down of Grant Terms and Conditions (Appendix A) and National Policy Requirements (Appendix B)].
- In accordance with Section 5 of the FDP Operating Procedures, when asked by the FDP Executive Committee, review proposed changes to the FDP General Terms and Conditions and Agency-Specific Requirements and recommend whether and how they should be implemented.
- Monitor new and changed statutes and OMB Circulars to determine whether changes to the FDP General Terms and Conditions or Agency-Specific Requirements are needed. When changes are necessary, recommend how they should be implemented.
- Interact with Office of Science and Technology Policy and others to encourage adoption of FDP terms and conditions for all federal granting agencies.
- Interact with non-FDP agencies to encourage adoption of FDP terms and conditions.

Major Accomplishments. Overhauled FDP Terms and Conditions and reformatted them to correspond to OMB Circular A-110.

Focus in the Next Year. Provide support to PL 106-107 implementation efforts to streamline grant terms and conditions (note: PL 106-107 is a government effort to implement simplified approaches to grant making and administration through the development of common systems and uniform administrative rules and reporting requirements). Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation, will help to lead this effort as co-chair, stepping in to replace Ann Stuart, who has retired. We thank Ann for her diligent participation in the FDP and her generous service to the Terms and Conditions Standing Committee.

Electronic Research Administration

Co-Chairs. Denise Clark, Cornell University; Jerry Stuck, National Science Foundation

Mission. The committee is to:

- Serve as umbrella entity to ERA related task groups.
- Furnish guidelines for ERA development.
- Provide perspectives of all members of the partnership regarding ERA initiatives.
- Establish and maintain relationships with other organizations' ERA initiatives; the Federal Electronic Commerce Committee (ECC); and the Federal Commons.
- Coordinate presentations.
- Maximize standards of input by maintaining the notion of objectivity through an honest broker role (stepping outside university/federal position and using a holistic viewpoint).
- Provide a bridging role to all other stakeholders (speak all languages to adjust communication gaps).

Major Accomplishments. The committee identified four focus groups to pursue activities in specific topical areas. The intent of each focus group was to identify the concerns and goals associated with that topic, establish timelines to address the concerns, and actively pursue satisfactory completion of the identified goals. These groups are:

- *Standards* (Jerry Stuck, NSF; Ken Forstmeier, Penn State) – Established to play an active role in adopting standards and articulating methods of change. A strawman Model Trading Partner Agreement (MTPA) was developed. Trading Partner Agreements (TPA) are used routinely in Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) as a way for trading partners to define the details of exchanging data via EDI. Parameters addressed in TPAs include the transactions sets, implementation conventions, and versions to be used; partner performance requirements (response times, good faith, etc.); and other partnership details. TPAs are generally bilateral; the MTPA was presented as an alternative to the prospect of negotiating the many bilateral TPAs that would normally be required.

- *Presidential Review Directive* (PRD) (Russ Lea, North Carolina State; Denise Clark, Cornell) – Established to provide a draft response covering ERA issues to the Executive Committee.
- *EDI Pilot* (Steve Dowdy, MIT) – Established to develop a proposed demonstration. The group identified submission of the 194 transaction set (specific required data elements) via Electronic Data Interchange. Further discussions were held on the need to address inclusion of additional data elements, attachments, and the FastLane (the National Science Foundation's electronic proposal submission system) interface. Discussions on planning for inclusion of EDI 4020 versions of the transaction set were also initiated. As an incentive, participating institutions would be held harmless.
- *Private Sponsors* (Sue Keehn, NCURA; Don Denson, Emory) – Established, in a joint effort with the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA), to pursue the possibility of coordinating ERA initiatives with private sponsors. Tammy Custer Ordway (Cornell) and Sue Keehn are working with NCURA on creating a database similar to the NCURA Cookbook to collect data from private sponsors.

The committee reported several other activities. First, it formed a new task force, co-chaired by Carlos Aburto-Vargas (Kent State) and Denise Clark (Cornell), to work on issues related to PL 106-107. Reporting directly to the Executive Committee with Denise Clark (Co-Chair of the ERA Standing Committee) serving as liaison, this group has planned several coordinated activities, specifically:

- Prepare a letter to OMB for the FDP chair's signature advocating that a managed, government-wide approach be used for the deployment of new ERA systems that are developed outside of the Federal Commons.
- Identify agencies deploying unilaterally developed initiatives and prepare a customized shell letter, including the institutional concerns associated with that initiative.
- Follow up with the agency to discuss remediation and, if appropriate, membership

in FDP.

- Assign task force members to monitor specific sets of agencies.
- A separate group of task force members will review agency plans as published in the Federal Register and develop FDP responses for Executive Committee approval.
- Several meetings and teleconferences were held with agencies to discuss their electronic initiatives in the context of PL 106-107. The committee also developed a set of Core Principles for ERA systems that is to be distributed with the shell letter to agencies and will be included in the FDP response to the PL 106-107 request for comments.

Second, the committee played an active role in agency coordination and initiatives by participating in the Inter-Agency Electronic Grants Committee (IAEGC) and Electronic Commerce Committee (ECC) meetings.

Third, the National Science Foundation and 19 FDP institutions joined in a demonstration of e-signatures on NSF proposal cover sheets. The Electronic Signature Pilot was started in May 2000 and remains in effect.

Finally, the committee provided feedback and advice to National Institutes of Health management on their plans for ERA implementation activities.

Focus in the Next Year. The committee will:

- Continue to be a focal point for ERA related activities within the FDP.
- Maintain active involvement with government initiatives through the PL 106-107 task force.
- Continue active involvement with federal agency committees to provide input and advice to the data standards process.
- Continue to maintain the FDP as a vital information resource through a robust website.
- Continue to explore pilot demonstrations with federal agencies (e.g. NSF e-Signature Pilot).
- Provide advice and support to ongoing task groups (e.g., Federal Funding Opportunity).

Subcommittees of the ERA Standing Committee

Web and Communications.

Co-Chairs. Don Denson, Emory University; Tammy Custer Ordway, Cornell University

Mission. The subcommittee has the mission of making the FDP website user friendly with up-to-date information and establishing and maintaining listservs to facilitate communication among the membership.

Major Accomplishments. John Pezzullo, Georgetown University and former FDP webmaster, developed the official PRD-4 Response Website. Comments on the entire report or individual sections were entered electronically and forwarded to OSTP for consideration in developing its final report. John turned over responsibility for the FDP web page to the ERA Standing Committee last year. John had been the FDP webmaster since the creation of our website but due to a job change, he could no longer continue working with the FDP. The ERA Standing Committee appointed Tammy Custer Ordway and Don Denson as co-chairs for Web and Communications. They immediately resolved to give the website a new look, with a more modern design and easier navigation: all attachment files (minutes, presentations, documents) are being converted to PDF files so they can be easily opened; major cleanup of pages with outdated information is underway; and old files are being archived. The registration form was converted to an interactive PDF file that can be filled out online, printed and submitted as a clean copy. Web statistics were added to track "hits" for each page.

The web and communications subcommittee is also responsible for establishing and maintaining all of the FDP listservs. The FDP members' listserv and numerous committee lists are supported by Emory University. Cornell University maintains the FDP friends' listserv and many newer committee lists. These listservs remain a critical communication link for our entire membership as well as individual committees, task forces and working groups.

Focus in the Next Year. The subcommittee will continue to make the web site user friendly; to work with the National Academies on on-line registration submission; and continual cleanup of the outdated information and upkeep of the website.

Publications

Co-Chairs. Joanne Cobble, San Diego State University Foundation; Elaine Simonds, Johns Hopkins University

Mission. The subcommittee has the mission of developing materials to promote an understanding of the function of the Federal Demonstration Partnership and enhancing its activities by communicating regularly with all members of the partnership, including university administrations, the university research community, representatives of all relevant branches of the federal government, professional organizations, and other interested groups.

Major Accomplishments. The Publications subcommittee was formed in March 2000. After an organizational phase, the group has been working on production of the FDP's first-ever annual report. This document is the fruits of their labor.

Focus in the Next Year. The subcommittee will provide for the communication needs of the FDP as we head into FDP IV and beyond.

Faculty PRD ad hoc Committee

Chair. Susan Brauhut, University of Massachusetts at Lowell

Mission. The faculty *ad hoc* committee assists the Faculty Representative to the Executive Committee in defining, selecting and developing themes to be presented and discussed during each meeting of the FDP. They also write white papers and collect information from their campuses to document faculty positions or perspectives on particular issues. The membership is fluid, in that the chair often adds faculty members to the committee according to their respective expertise.

Major Accomplishments. A Faculty Steering Committee was formed to identify appropriate topics for discussion. Faculty panel

discussions were organized on the following topics:

- The Relationship Between Education and Research
- Modular Grants
- Renewing the Government-University Partnership
- Outreach to Non-Federal Agencies
- Impact of A-110 and EPA Inspections on Investigators
- Internet Security for ERA
- Agency Specific Regulations Regarding Adverse Event Reporting
- Impact of NIH Institutional Visits
- Unionization of Graduate Students

Following each of these presentations, statements were published on the FDP website to clarify faculty positions, concerns, and recommendations. These contributions helped to firmly establish the participation and role of faculty representatives in the FDP.

At the June 2000 meeting, Bill Olbricht (Cornell) was elected to succeed Susan Brauhut as the faculty representative. Olbricht observed that the faculty representatives have a unique forum in which to discuss a broad range of issues that affect the quality and productivity of research and education.

Focus in the Next Year. The faculty representatives plan to address the following issues:

- Electronic Research Administration (ERA) – Faculty researchers are affected directly by electronic systems intended to streamline research administration. Various agencies are implementing electronic administrative systems but it is uncertain whether they will help standardize administrative practices and enhance faculty productivity. Among the groups participating in ERA developments, FDP is unique in having faculty involved in the early stages of system design and testing. The faculty will work to support FDP's vision of a common interface among federal agencies for electronic research administration such as the Federal Commons.
- Integration of Teaching and Research – The faculty representatives will explore ways in which research administrative processes can

further promote the integration of research and teaching and will also look for ways to communicate its benefits to the nation. The faculty representatives will focus on ways to help agencies develop practices that support graduate students in their dual roles as researchers and students. They will also explore relationships between research funding, research administration, and workforce requirements.

- Research Integrity and Ethics – The faculty representatives will advise agencies and universities that are developing programs in response to recent federal initiatives related to the Responsible Conduct of Research.
- Research Performance Measures – A focus group will be formed to explore ways in which the faculty representatives can assist federal agencies in developing appropriate performance measures for research programs in conjunction with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).
- Outreach Activities – The faculty representatives will explore mechanisms to increase awareness of the FDP among scientific societies, non-federal organizations that support sponsored research, and federal government entities with interests in promoting the development of policies and procedures to ensure the most effective and efficient use of federal research resources.

Task Forces

Contracts

Co-Chairs. Mary Armstead, National Institutes of Health; Samuela Evans, University of California System

Mission. The task force's mission is:

- To identify common practices in contracts processing that can be expedited by uniform procedures within FDP III.
- To design, monitor, and evaluate new procedures and concepts that respond to the legal requirements of the contracting process but do so more efficiently.
- To study the similarities and differences between the grant and contract processes to see if gains in costs and efficiency can be

generated by adapting some of the FDP grant procedures for use with contracts.

Major Accomplishments. The task force reports that it compiled National Institutes of Health (NIH) Contract Flow-Down Clauses for Educational Institutions. The listing of flow-down clauses for use in cost-reimbursement R&D subcontracts from commercial prime contractors to educational institutions is now posted at the NIH Contracts web page:
<http://ocm.od.nih.gov/contracts/rfps/FDP/FDPclausecover.html>

It also compiled Office of Naval Research (ONR) Contract Flow-Down Clauses for Educational Institutions. The final list of flow-down clauses for commercial prime contractors to use with educational institution subcontractors is now posted on the ONR website,
<http://www.onr.navy.mil/scripts/02/model.asp>

Focus in the Next Year. The committee will focus on:

- Department of Energy Management and Operating Contractors Flow-Down Clauses for Educational Institutions.
- NASA Contract Flow-Down Clauses from Commercial Contractors for Educational Institutions.
- Model University Subcontracts - A generic boilerplate subcontract for FDP institutions to use with one another.
- Master Subcontracting Plans - ONR's progress with using these will be followed.

Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting

Co-Chairs. Robert Hardy, National Science Foundation; Julie Norris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Mission. To identify streamlining opportunities for Effort Reporting Systems, identify best practices and explore avenues to reduce federal requirements for Effort Certification.

Major Accomplishments. The Task Force engaged in discussions and activities related to the Presidential Review Directive (PRD-4) culminating in the development of a demonstration project designed to address

several of the principles articulated in the NSTC Report on PRD-4 issued in April 1999.

At the December 3, 1999, meeting in San Francisco the FDP approved a demonstration project that originated at the FDP meeting in Orlando the previous year. The Task Force made a decision to separate the related issues of cost sharing and effort reporting and to focus exclusively on the problems and complexities associated with effort reporting. The approved demonstration project, entitled *A Proposal for an Initiative on Enhancing Accountability With Qualitative Reporting*, addressed the following two Operating Principles from the NSTC report: (a) "Accountability and Accounting Are Not the Same" and (b) "Agencies and Universities Should Manage Research in A Cost-Efficient Manner." The specific objectives of the demonstration project were to assess:

- whether technical and other progress reports satisfy awarding agency requirements for accountability;
- what potential cost savings may be achieved with the elimination of time and effort reporting;
- whether the qualitative assessment methods currently used meet federal agency needs for stewardship;
- whether the absence of time and effort reporting has any unintended consequences on scientific outcomes or research progress.

On March 31, 2000 the FDP wrote to Joseph Kull, Deputy Controller of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), asking for approval to commence a demonstration project for ten FDP institutions covering a two-year period beginning July 1, 2000. On June 6, 2000 Co-Chairs Hardy and Norris met with officials from the OMB and the Department of Health and Human Services to discuss the demonstration. Although this meeting did not result in approval (or rejection) of the demonstration, it provided an opportunity to discuss many of the issues underlying the demonstration and to pose other questions and concerns to the federal officials.

Focus in the Next Year. At the end of 2000 the status of the demonstration was uncertain. OMB approval was delayed pending finalization of an OMB Clarification on Cost Sharing. Although the demonstration did not move forward in 2000, it is clear that the work of the Task Force

had a significant influence on the development of the clarification. In 2001 the task force will assess the impact of the OMB Clarification (issued January 5, 2001) on the institutions included in the demonstration to determine if it sufficiently addresses the problems associated with effort reporting or whether FDP should reengage OMB in discussions to commence the demonstration.

Electronic Approval and Routing Systems (EARS)

Co-Chairs. Pamela Webb, Northwestern University; Nancy Wilkinson, Emory University

Mission. EARS (Electronic Approval and Routing Systems) is a collaboration of the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) and the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA) whose purpose is to share knowledge about electronic approval and routing systems and their design, development, and implementation in the field of research administration. EARS is also dedicated to promoting the development and adoption of standards for the creation and deployment of these systems.

Major Accomplishments. The EARS Task Force was designed to function through several subgroups: Business Rules Committee, Technology Committee, and Electronic Communication Committee. Of these, only the Electronic Communication Committee (Co-Chairs. Kathleen Lamett, NCURA; Jo Ann Treat, Texas A&M Research Foundation) has been active as a group. Their website was developed in 1999 and all of the materials that had been on the FDP site were transferred to the new site (<http://earsfdp.org/>). The EARS focus subsequently changed and during 1999-2000 no changes or updates were made. The web site is still functional, but is otherwise inactive.

On August 4, 1999, in conjunction with NCURA's ERA IV conference, the EARS Task Force held its second national symposium on the state of electronic approval and routing systems in the field of research administration. In December 1999, the goals and mission of the group were re-examined due to the following: rapidly changing technology, the specificity of practices at various institutions, results from an EARS survey indicating few new developments,

limited work being done in the creation and adoption of workflow systems, and federal agencies having difficulty defining their intentions. Although the review resulted in scaling back the task force, group members continued to promote the creation of standards, the advancement of business rules related to electronic routing and approval systems, and other EARS related issues and concepts.

Focus in the Next Year. During the summer of 2001, the committee will evaluate the state of electronic routing and approval developments and research future opportunities for the advancement of EARS and prepare a status report.

Electronic Notification of Awards

Co-Chairs. Bob Meyer, Pennsylvania State University; L. Bradley Stanford, Office of Naval Research

Mission. The Electronic Award Task Force (EATF) will:

- Develop a methodology for a Demonstration of Electronic Notification of Award using Electronic Data Interchange (ENA/EDI).
- Seek approval from the FDP to conduct a Demonstration of ENA/EDI.
- Conduct such a Demonstration.
- Evaluate the Demonstration.
- Report progress and results of the Demonstration.

Major Accomplishments. The task force completed its prime demonstration, testing the feasibility of sending an EDI award document stream in the body of an e-mail. Through the combined efforts of about twenty institutions and several federal agencies, we successfully managed the sending and receipting for award messages structured so that the data could be entered automatically in a local institutional database.

Focus in the Next Year. The task force will compile results of a survey of institutional participants and prepare a report summarizing those results. Having completed its primary objective, the task force will likely disband.

Integrated Performance Standards (recently renamed Federal Funding Opportunity Task Force)

Co-Chairs. Jean Feldman, National Science Foundation; Erin B. Lindsay, California Institute of Technology; Jerry Stuck (Ex Officio), National Science Foundation

Mission. The Federal Funding Opportunity Task Force will identify opportunities to standardize and simplify business rules associated with federal research assistance and develop demonstrations to test and implement those standards. The initial focus is to improve the announcement of the funding opportunities process through development of a uniform format for clearly communicating the business rules and performance standards for the program.

This group works toward the ultimate goal of standardizing and testing the business rules and performance standards within funding announcements for electronic transmission to university electronic research management systems and funding opportunities databases. Subtasks include:

- Through examination of sample funding opportunities from all participating FDP agencies, identify business rules and performance standards commonly referenced within funding opportunity announcements.
- Identify necessary data elements.
- Design template for announcement of funding opportunities.
- Test concept with a subset of agencies and institutions to validate the concepts.
- Coordinate effort, as appropriate, with other FDP Task Forces.
- Test use of XML to electronically transmit funding opportunity information to a subset of institutions.
- Increase coordination with related efforts outside the FDP, including but not limited to, the PL 106-107 Preaward Working Group and the Federal Commons.

Major Accomplishments. The task force:

- Finalized the federal funding opportunity analysis document that identified, by data element, the contents of funding opportunities from all participating FDP

agencies;

- Further refined the funding opportunity template, including addition of a new section that summarizes the business rules of the opportunity;
- Increased coordination with the Federal Commons, Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps: <http://www.fedbizopps.gov/>) effort;
- Received update on NSF's efforts to electronically transmit funding opportunity information through a new system known as the Program Information Management System; and
- Conducted preliminary discussions with NSF on testing the use of XML to transmit data.

Focus in the Next Year. The task force will focus on:

- Completion of the proposed template for dissemination of funding opportunities for participating FDP agencies;
- Continued, and increased, coordination with external efforts such as the PL 106-107 Preaward Working Group and the Federal Commons; and
- Testing the use of the proposed template with a subset of FDP agencies.

Subawards

Co-Chairs. Bob Killoren, Pennsylvania State University; Robert Silverman, Office of Naval Research

Mission. The task force's mission is to:

- Develop model subaward language for FDP-FDP subawards and FDP-nonFDP subawards.
- Explore ways of using ERA for making subawards.
- Present to ONR a position statement regarding subawards vs. procurement actions.

Major Accomplishments. The task force completed work on a statement concerning subawards and their status under OMB Circular A-110. The document clearly differentiated between subawards and subcontracts, the latter subject to procurement regulations contained in A-110 and the former considered financial

assistance for subrecipients and not subject to the procurement section of A-110. This statement was approved by the Office of Naval Research, the government's cognizant agency for subcontracting and subawards. It was also approved by the Office of Management and Budget with a minor clarification concerning the statement's relationship to definitions under OMB Circular A-133.

Focus for the Next Year. The task force will complete work on the development of a subaward agreement form that can be adopted by FDP institutions for a demonstration project on processing subawards under the approved statement.

Completed Task Forces

Although completed in terms of fulfilling their primary mission, these task groups will be regenerated as the Federal Commons evolves.

Institutional Profiles

Co-Chairs. Denise Clark, Cornell University; Diana L. Jaeger, National Institutes of Health; Jerry Stuck (Ex Officio), Federal Demonstration Partnership (on detail from NSF to coordinate ERA initiatives)

Mission. To design and test a standard set of data and identify how and by whom it will be maintained. Specific tasks are to:

- Identify all data elements necessary for all agencies to identify and report on awardee organizations.
- Identify where data will be stored.
- Design a system to provide one time registration and periodic updates of data.
- Test concept with at least a subset of agencies and institutions to validate.
- Coordinate with the Federal Electronic Commerce activities.

Major Accomplishments. An extensive list of static elements was cataloged. The task force recommended that each institution populate the database once, with the capability of periodic updates upon institutional changes in the elements cited. They further recommended that this static institutional information be linked to static audit information (that part received into the Federal Commons direct from the cognizant

audit agency, input from the institution) to develop a complete institutional profile.

Work was completed in early 1999 and the task force officially terminated. A tie remains between the FDP pilot and the Federal Commons via the ERA Committee. Through this linkage, feedback to the FDP on the pilot will occur on a regular basis. Future opportunities to expand the scope of the institutional profile should also remain a consideration of the FDP. For instance, if the pilot is successful, thought may be given to expanding the profile to include elements essential in subcontracting activities. Future expansion to an agency profile should also be examined.

Professional Profiles

Co-Chairs. Jean I. Feldman, National Science Foundation; Ann W. Wilks-Penrod, The University of Memphis; Jerry Stuck (Ex Officio), Federal Demonstration Partnership (on detail from NSF to coordinate ERA initiatives)

Mission. To design and demonstrate an electronic data set for submission of professional data by principal and co-principal investigators and other senior project personnel.

Major Accomplishments. The task force developed and proposed an FDP Common Form for Biographical Sketch Data Elements and closed the project in February 1998.

