

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS/BURDEN WORKING GROUP

<b>POINT OF CONTACT</b>	Sara Bible, Stanford University Jim Luther, Duke University
<b>CHARGE</b>	This working group is focused on identifying ways to recover more of the administrative costs related to individual sponsored project activities. The primary interest in doing so is to address the faculty concern that too much of their time is spent dealing with administrative tasks rather than research. In addition, this working group is focused on efficient and effective implementation of the Uniform Guidance (UG) and specific Federal agency requirements.
<b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b>	<p>For the past two years, the working group has held panels with Federal and University representatives to present and discuss two important topics. Work on these topics has been ongoing between meetings through discussions with Federal representatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of the Uniform Guidance, including suggestions for simplification, change in the regulations, and development and incorporation of Frequently Asked Questions through technical corrections to the UG.</li><li>• The NIH's change from pooled accounts to SubAccounts for Letter of Credit (LOC) draws. Partnership between NIH and FDP member institutions has facilitated improved processes.</li></ul>
<b>AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING</b>	<p>There were three sessions during the meeting, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sally Rockey, Deputy Director of Extramural Research, NIH held a session to gather input from FDP members on low hanging fruit in the area of burden.</li><li>• Jim Luther, Dan Evon and Nate Martinez-Wayman discussed NIH's transition from Pooled Account Reporting to SubAccount and the potential impact on areas such as LOC draws, resource workload management, subrecipient management, internal controls, general ledger closing and other challenges that face both the grantees and federal agencies during Uniform Guidance implementation.</li><li>• Dan Evon, Jim Luther and Sara Bible focused on open Uniform Guidance implementation issues including Project Closeout Reporting, Compensation - Personal Services, Internal Controls, the Single Audit and Conflicts of Interest policies being implemented by various funding agencies.</li></ul>

<b>KEY DECISIONS PENDING</b>	Will the Division of Payment Management (DPM) allow LOC draws during the closeout period between day 90 and 120? Will DPM eliminate the requirement for a Federal Cash Transaction Report, SF-272 given the change to SubAccounts?
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	Members of the Administrative Costs/Burden Working Group and other attendees of the FDP meeting have participated in the working group sessions.
<b>MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the Division of Payment Management (DPM) allow LOC draws during the closeout period between day 90 and 120. Will DPM eliminate the requirement for a Federal Cash Transaction Report, SF-272 given the change to SubAccounts?</li> <li>• Will OMB/COFAR accept further input on the Uniform Guidance regulations and implementation of open items such as Compensation – Personal Services and COI policies among various funding agencies?</li> <li>• Will there be a review of the Federal implementation of the Uniform Guidance for consistency among agencies and for simplified policies and processes. FDP should start this discussion among its federal and institutional partners.</li> </ul>
<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Rockey asked for low hanging fruit in regards to burden. She received input from attendees on various topics including, but not limited to, the following: modular budgets, bio-sketch requirements, reporting final financial report, eliminating patent report including elimination of gender bias, uniformity of systems, AgriResearch, PHS FCOI policy including review at time of proposal rather than ‘just in time’ at the time of proposal, and extension of the review and disclosure beyond research, e.g. administrative and teaching activities.</li> <li>• Dan Evon, Jim Luther and Nate Martinez-Wayman reviewed the background of the pending NIH transition to the subaccount Letter of Credit system and discussed the impact on institutional business processes and systems, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changing internal project codes, and balancing burden between central offices and departments</li> <li>2. Preparing for potentially significant volume of Transitional FFRs</li> <li>3. Issuing subawards as new or amended agreements</li> <li>4. Modifying LOC process/tool to ensure all draws occur before subaccount funds expire</li> </ol> </li> <li>• Dan Evon, Jim Luther and Sara Bible focused on open Uniform Guidance implementation issues including:</li> </ul>

1. Project Closeout Reporting: Advocate for “uniformity” at 120 days among agencies through a change to the Uniform Guidance, rather than agency by agency implementation, and educate your institutional community about the different requirements – create a matrix to display varying requirements
2. Compensation - Personal Services: Consider Institutional Base Salary, Extra Service Pay, Incidental Activities, Intra IHE Consulting, Standards of Documentation, etc. Consider change in institutional requirements or wait for audits of FDP pilot institutions. Consider making small changes, overall changes or wait for further information.
3. Internal Controls: Communicate with Controller’s Office and Single Audit firm about COSO internal controls requirements, and write internal control narratives on key processes.
4. Single Audit: Connect with your Single Audit firm about their plans and expectations for future audits
5. Conflicts of Interest: Policies being implemented by various funding agencies. Some agencies are requiring review and disclosure at time of proposal rather than ‘just in time’.

**WEBSITE**

[http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA\\_058487](http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_058487)

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: eRA STANDING COMMITTEE

<p><b>POINT OF CONTACT</b></p>	<p>Mark Sweet or Jason Hitchcock</p>
<p><b>CHARGE</b></p>	<p>eRA Standing Committee</p>
<p><b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b></p>	<p><b>21st Century Tools for the FDP</b></p> <p>Given the increase in size of the FDP membership for Phase VI, our working group plans to explore the use of collaborative tools to enhance and facilitate FDP’s communication and planning. Leads include Andrew Gray, Rebecca Puig and Ron Splittgerber. Link to full description: <a href="http://goo.gl/7J3luw">http://goo.gl/7J3luw</a></p> <p><b>Streamlining Proposal Submission</b></p> <p>This group is working to identify and prioritize the many opportunities for improvements that exist in the application process, from institutional registration in federal systems through application submission and status tracking. We will propose strategies to implement improvements and work with FDP institutions, federal agencies, and Grants.gov to implement pilots, demonstrations, or proposed solutions. Activities under this group include the Grants.gov JAD team and the SciENcv group. Leads include Debbi Nixon, Lori Schultz, Megan Columbus and Ron Splittgerber. Link to full description: <a href="http://goo.gl/vawVPO">http://goo.gl/vawVPO</a></p> <p><b>Grants Life-Cycle Roadmap</b></p> <p>The purpose of this group is to develop an end-to-end picture of the electronic grant life cycle road map in order to identify and prioritize pain points to identify potential projects for the FDP eRA Committee in Phase VI. Leads include Bill Hunn, Courtney Swaney, Megan Columbus and Tammy Custer. Link to full description: <a href="http://goo.gl/r4iwTD">http://goo.gl/r4iwTD</a></p> <p><b>Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA)</b></p>

The DATA Working Group is led by a combination of participants from the FDP Open Government Group (Richard Fenger, David Curran) and the eRA Standing Committee (Don Turner, Mark Sweet, Bronda Harrison, Jason Hitchcock). The purpose of the working group is to keep tabs on the activities of OMB and Treasury as they implement the DATA. In addition, FDP will provide feedback, guidance, and offer testing/validation assistance as the DATA enters pilot phases. Link to full description: <http://goo.gl/WjNSmE>

### **Integrated Acquisition Environment**

The purpose of this working group is to identify potential improvements within the integrated acquisition environment, including SAM.gov, and provide input on new enhancements and features to facilitate the higher education community, such as integrating the Federal Clearinghouse. Leads include Steve Dowdy, Courtney Swaney, and Carolyn Pappas. Link to full description: <http://goo.gl/QwV945>

### **AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING**

The May 2015 meeting was used to inform the membership of the broad goals of the eRA Standing Committee and to look for ways to identify potential projects or demonstrations as we enter Phase VI

### **KEY DECISIONS PENDING**

Analysis of working group sessions is necessary to identify potential projects or demonstrations.

### **PARTICIPATION**

### **MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED**

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

eRA Standing Committee discussed the priority areas identified in the Jan2015 visioning session. These priority areas will serve as the over-arching priorities we will focus on over the next phase. Most of the priority areas had working group sessions to discuss in more details with FDP members and solicit ideas for possible projects or demonstrations as we move into Phase VI. Summary slides are posted on the FDP website.

### **WEBSITE**

May 2015 site: <https://sites.google.com/site/fdperamay2015/>

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: ERI

<b>POINT OF CONTACT</b>	Co-Chairs: Susan Anderson, College of Charleston and David Earwicker, Sacramento State; Federal Liaisons: Jamie French (incoming) and Charisse Carney-Nunes (outgoing), National Science Foundation
<b>CHARGE</b>	The Emerging Research Institution (ERI) Council seeks to provide an ERI perspective on and pathway to improved integration with the broader FDP agenda for the smaller institutions. Emphasis is placed on ways to facilitate more robust participation by ERIs in FDP initiatives and enhance the contributions of ERIs to the FDP Phase VI collective to ensure that the ERI perspective is always included.
<b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b>	The ERI council has formalized its structure and begun working to catalog the needs and priorities of ERI members while ensuring broad ERI representation on standing FDP committees. Further, the council will work with our NSF liaison on ways in which best practices from federal agencies can be integrated into ERI functions and agendas.
<b>AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• Review of the ERI working group, Structure and History (Charisse)</li> <li>• Vision for ERI (integration into Phase VI Priorities and Projects) (Cindy Hope)</li> <li>• Revisit Priorities and Needs of ERI membership (David)</li> <li>• Workgroup Membership – member identification and commitment to coordination (Susan)</li> </ul>
<b>KEY DECISIONS PENDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revising the ERI Draft Mission Statement</li> <li>• Naming of an ERI representative to the Executive Committee</li> <li>• Gathering baseline information about current ERI participation in FDP initiatives (post meeting)</li> <li>• Developing the Operating Plan for the ERI council</li> <li>• Provide FDP chair with draft sentence(s) to edit <a href="#">FDP Administrative Policies</a> to formalize ERI representation on FDP Executive Committee</li> <li>• Plans for comment intake and vote at September 2015</li> </ul>
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	20 participants from 14 universities and NSF, and FDP Chair Hope.
<b>MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	<p>The council has been given a clear charge from the Executive and Membership committees to formalize its operations, to determine the most effective ways to function as a means for ensuring ERI integration into FDP, and to chart a way forward to ensure that ERI participation works for both ERI schools and the broader FDP community.</p> <p>At the 5/12/15 Membership Committee meeting, Joanna Rom and Jane Zuber expressed their support for greater</p>

	<p>ERI engagement, including clarifying relationship of ERI council status and relationship to Exec and also possibly revisiting the Earnestine Psalmonds text of five years ago (Partnerships for Emerging Research Institutions – Report of a Workshop) as a source of both history and clarification to ensure coordination and not isolation. The emphasis for ERIs is on their status as smaller schools with a special set of needs (same issues, different impact) that cannot be forgotten in the context of the broader conversation regarding federal research support.</p>
<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	<p>The FDP chair attended and shared her vision of ERI participation in FDP activities. The ERI council is likely to emphasize issues of compliance due to different staffing and infrastructure issues than experienced by larger institutions. Conversation focused on effective ways to gather best practices, identify and archive resources of benefit to ERIs, and to determine which demonstration projects are likely to be of greatest benefit to ERI members in terms of increased efficiency and reducing faculty burden. Moving forward, the challenge as well will be to find a time to meet that does not conflict with member needs to attend other critical FDP sessions. Conversation turned to spending an extra 3-4 hours either in advance of the official start of the September meeting or after the official end of the meeting to allow more focused and deliberate conversation.</p>
<b>WEBSITE</b>	<p>(In development)</p>

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: SUBAWARDS

---

- Reminders:
  - Please do not change T&C of template, unless adding terms per Awarding Agency
  - Bugs and fixes to the templates are consistently ongoing. Please check the site often for revised versions.
  - Document on sub vs. vendor is posted to the FDP site in case we need any documentation to back up our determinations required by UG. NSF has said the proposal is the determination sub vs. vendor.
- Templates:
  - UG Mod Templates posted
  - NIH and NSF attachment 2s have been posted for comment; the final versions will be posted soon.
  - SOW template / guidance to be posted soon.
- Decisions and future action items:
  - Compliance Attachment: Addition of a new compliance attachment approved by the group. Compliance questions like COI will be moved to this specific attachment. Benefit of consistent language that does not overreach. Working group to be convened.
  - Invoicing Instructions: Addition of a new attachment for invoicing instructions. Group decided to handle this as an FAQ Partners. Working group to be convened.
  - Movement of some data elements from the face page to Attachment 6, NoA: group would like to see the proposed change. A. Humphrey to send around.
- Ongoing Project Updates:
  - S. Scott from Columbia presented on training and outreach on new templates; including recently posted FAQs.
  - Brenda Kavanaugh looking to develop clinical trials template. SOW samples work group will be posting for feedback soon.
  - Melissa Korf working with chairs for web solutions to upgrade website so the listserv can be used less and the site can host updates on project management as well as questions and answers.

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: UNIFORM GUIDANCE PROCUREMENT WORKING GROUP

<b>POINT OF CONTACT</b>	Debbie Rafi, Office of Naval Research Abe Sabbag, Office of Naval Research Edwin Bommel, Geisinger Health System Doug Backman, University of Central FL.
<b>CHARGE</b>	This working group is committed to the pursuit of effective and efficient procurement systems which provide a balanced approach to stewardship of federal funds. The working group will share best practices and brainstorm innovative concepts that can be demonstrated through pilots.
<b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• July 2014: Working group formed and co-chairs appointed.</li><li>• July 2014: Developed and conducted survey I amongst working group members to better understand the impact of the new procurement requirements.</li><li>• Nov. 2014: modified survey I and distributed to all FDP members to obtain larger sample.</li><li>• Nov. 2014 discussed the need/possibility of a brainstorming session.</li><li>• March 2015: brainstorming session at Stanford University: identified “troublesome” language in procurement section of UG; identified which area(s) would be best suited for a demonstration project; identified additional data elements to be surveyed in light of possible demonstration project.</li><li>• April 2015: Conducted exploratory survey to attendees of brainstorming meeting, collected/accumulated survey I results.</li><li>• May 2015: updated the FDP members of the survey I results and the outcomes of the brainstorming session. Solicited feedback.</li></ul>
<b>AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• General overview and update since last meeting.</li><li>• Discuss Survey I (purpose and objective; data metrics summary; survey conclusions).</li><li>• Discuss the Procurement Working Group Brainstorming Session (purpose of meeting, make up of participating institutions, review of possible problem language in UG, and possible areas to demonstrate, discuss 80/20 rule, next steps).</li></ul>
<b>KEY DECISIONS PENDING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Based on OMB Guidance, determine if the exploratory survey should be expanded (number of survey questions and sample size)</li><li>• Will we propose a demonstration project based on individual institution’s size (80/20 risk level) or a fixed amount (COGR is proposing to raise the micro purchase threshold to \$10k)</li></ul>
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	Members of the Uniform Guidance Procurement Working Group and other attendees of the FDP meeting have participated in the working group sessions.

<b>MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The single most troublesome area in need of demonstration is the \$3k threshold</li> <li>• Demonstration project should focus on this issue</li> </ul>
<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	<p>Doug Backman presented the results of the first survey. Survey results showed that almost all participants have thresholds for pcard and/or competitive bid processes above \$3k. Debbie Rafi and Edwin Bommel discussed the brainstorming session held at Stanford University. Debbie explained how the session came about and the makeup of the attendees. Attendees were selected based on geographic location, institution type and size. Attendees were required to include representation from both research administration and procurement. Edwin listed the areas of the procurement section identified during the meeting with troublesome language and discussed the area in need of a demonstration (micro purchase threshold). Debbie went in further detail of the risk level (80/20 rule) which identifies for each institutions where 80% of its transaction are but where 20% of total dollars are spent. Debbie explained that this may be how we should define our demonstration project. COGR representative (Dave Kennedy) noted that this is different from COGR's proposal (\$ increase limit to \$10k) but at least one institution shared its concern that \$10k will still be a step back for them. Debbie explained that she will reach out to OMB and share our intent to demonstrate this. She will discuss the exploratory survey with OMB and seek guidance on whether the survey should be expanded.</p>
<b>WEBSITE</b>	<p><a href="http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_147194">http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_147194</a></p>

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## COMMITTEE REPORT: MEMBERSHIP STANDING COMMITTEE

<b>POINT OF CONTACT</b>	Jane Zuber ( <a href="mailto:jzuber@tamus.edu">jzuber@tamus.edu</a> )
<b>CHARGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring attendance and participation</li> <li>• Assuring vendor participation complies with FDP policy</li> <li>• Receiving, evaluating and recommending requests for additional affiliate membership</li> <li>• Encouraging increased federal participation and membership</li> <li>• Facilitating the transition process for new FDP phases</li> <li>• Updating and overseeing Executive Committee nomination/election procedures</li> <li>• Supporting Emerging Research Institution (ERI) full participation in FDP activities</li> <li>• Phase VI Information</li> </ul>
<b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b>	<p>Registration desk – provide assistance to FDP staff at each meeting</p> <p>Institutional mentoring – match new attendee institutions with mentors</p> <p>ERI activities – work with ERI to facilitate their efforts and become a separate committee</p> <p>Member attendance and feedback – work with FDP staff to monitor attendance and provide feedback</p>
<b>AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING</b>	<p>FDP Annual Report</p> <p>Emerging Research Institutions</p> <p>Member Engagement and Roles</p> <p>Listserv</p>
<b>KEY DECISIONS PENDING</b>	Content of Annual Report.
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	Present: Becky Hayes, Deb Murphy, Andrew Campbell, Sandy Schneider, Gina Hedberg, Joanne Altieri, Glory Brown, Mary Ann Ottinger, Charisse Carney-Nunes, Joanna Rom, Jane Zuber
<b>MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	Continue focusing on increasing opportunities for faculty participation at FDP meetings. Work with ERI subcommittee to transition to committee.

## MEETING SUMMARY

Membership committee staff were thanked for their help in staffing the registration desk for the May meeting. In particular, Joanne Altieri, Glory Brown, Becky Hayes, Gina Hedberg and Mary Ann Ottinger. Charisse Carney-Nunes was introduced as the new Membership Committee Co-Chair. This meeting was Joanna Rom's last meeting as Membership Committee Co-Chair. The committee thanked Joanna for her years of excellent service and tireless efforts on behalf of FDP and noted that she will be missed.

FDP Annual Report: The committee formed a working group to spearhead annual report efforts in collaboration with the Co-Chairs. Working group committee chair Becky Hayes will be joined by Glory Brown, Jeanne Hermann-Petrin and Mary Ann Ottinger. After the May meeting the Co-Chairs will revise the annual report content in collaboration with the Executive Committee, then finalize and distribute the report to members for completion prior to the September meeting. Revisions to the annual report will focus on more clearly identifying FDP members' participation. The committee will ask that an e-mail is sent to each IHE's faculty member to let them know that the administrative member received the request to complete the annual report. Members are encouraged to have the faculty, administrative and technical members work together to complete the annual report.

Emerging Research Institutions: Committee discussion included how ERI needs have transitioned within the organization and the special needs of those member institutions including the need to identify specific opportunities to participate. Areas to explore fully include how to ensure full participation of ERI, identification of areas of special interest for engagement and determining to better understand ERI structures and options for enhancing initiatives. Members noted that ERI participation now includes 15 to 20 institutions and the need to identify challenges and commonalities faced in this areas is a priority. Discussion ensued regarding ERI's identity separate from the Membership Committee and mention was made that ERI will have a member on the Executive Committee going forward. Other groups that may have "affinity interests" include healthcare organizations or laboratories without an identified academic focus. Future efforts may involve linking some of these groups together.

Member Engagement and Roles: Continuing discussion emphasized the need to clearly identify how faculty involvement can be increased within the committee and for FDP in general. Although some progress has been made by working groups there is continuing concern that it is no clear guidance on how faculty can and should participate in committees and activities and what their role is. There is continuing need to offer sessions, work groups and presentations aimed at faculty interests and concerns to increase faculty engagement in FDP.

The committee is committed to enhancing future meeting agendas to include faculty interests in addition to the state of federal initiatives and administrative issues to more fully involve faculty. Follow on discussion included the need to develop more clearly defined lines of communication, the need to provide guidance to the subgroups and identify methods for holding subgroup meetings. Suggestions were made regarding initiating Café Style Conversation Groups, the possibility of offering Dinner Groups as a means of developing stronger institutional and individual relationships.

	Member Lists: Committee members were reminded to confirm that they are included on the committee's listserv. Listserv participation can be confirmed by using the link on the FDP website.
<b>WEBSITE</b>	<a href="http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055746">http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_055746</a>

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: Faculty Subcommittee - Animal Research

---

- Previous report found that a lot of burden in animal research is self-inflicted by the institution and involves exceeding federal requirements
- Ideas for points of discussion:
  - o DEA,
  - o Annual Review of Protocol
- Faculty member from the University of Maine commented on the need for universal protocols for basic procedures
  - o Other group members commented that their universities, and most universities, have standard operating procedures.
    - Susan commented that OLAW supports SOPs and offered to provide link to OLAW FAQ on SOPs
    - Computer systems can help IACUCs and investigators streamline SOPs and protocol approval.
    - Protocols and the IACUC should be as flexible as possible.
  - o Harvard has a committee that is reexamining animal use protocols and looking at what makes sense, what doesn't. Duke underwent a similar process a few years ago. This process has resulted in simpler protocol forms.
  - o Ron Banks commented that individual protocols forms make administrators' jobs easier while fewer protocols make investigators' jobs easier – need to find a balance.
  - o Duke: No change checkmark is an option in their annual report.
  - o Different comfort levels for different institutions and IACUCs
- Grant funding vs. protocol review – often not in sync
  - o Susan noted that OLAW won't agree to IACUC approving an animal use protocol for five year protocol – too much in research is unpredictable.
  - o Okay if IACUCs/Institutes reset the clock on required three year protocol review after a protocol amendment.
  - o Warn investigators when amending protocol and close to review?
  - o Alternative search – when increasing pain and distress – potential issue.
- Reproducibility vs animal numbers
  - o Hard to plan, hard to know how many animals to use.
  - o Just need approximate numbers under significant changes guidance. IACUCs can set an acceptable range.
- Susan informed the group of progress toward creating the IACUC institute – a USDA, NSF and NIH initiative – that will focus on training IACUC trainers (and eventually IACUC members and administrators) to teach meta issues rather than minute details – understanding vs facts.
  - o This will train IACUC to reduce burden and increase compliance.

- Group was very supportive of this idea and asked how they could help
- Steve Niemi of Harvard is working on creating a performance standards database.
  
- Comments from Richard Costanzo from VCU on the DEA
  - Not new regulations but needed to register hundreds of animal users at VCU to use non-pharmaceutical drugs in research – led to lag in research and waiting period.
  - Previously, researchers could obtain drugs from university pharmacy.
  - Recommendations for change
    - Special classification as researchers/vets?
    - Multiple animal facilities, investigators need registration for each facility.
- Ron Banks from Duke on DEA
  - DEA is huge issue, regulations built for the '70s and humans.
  - Lack of regional and local DEA coordination.
  - No records required for practitioners – inconsistency in record keeping requirements.
  - University must pay \$300 in fees for registration – can't come from federal grants.
- Loretta Gerrity from U of Alabama said her institution had reached a reasonable compromise with DEA
- JR Hayward said that Michigan State has problems similar to those at VCU and Duke
- Lots of confusion on DEA's side about who can use and handle drugs.
- Idea for FDP to gather data on what was required by region – best, worst case scenario.
- FDP does not /cannot lobby federal agencies.
  - Alexis and Cheryl discussed parameters for FDP to address issue.
    - Suggested that FDP partners find and share best practices within member organizations
    - Data collection and preparation of a paper is acceptable.
    - Group may have to collaborate with CoGR or other to implement ideas for change.
  - Group agreed to collect data regarding issues.
- Susan informed group of progress toward creating the IACUC institute.
- Discussion of creating IACUC best practices
  - Would OLAW support/endorse?
  - Unnecessary practices? OLAW does not operate in the negative.
  - Best management practices for IACUC/AV.
  - Templates? Templates more useful for small institutions.
  - Role of AV.
- Research compliance retreat in September
  - Make sure the right people are there.
  - How to get IACUC members? Administrators?

Next steps DEA Issues set up subcommittee to follow up, determine what are issues meet through GoToMeeting, collect information from member organizations

# Federal Demonstration Partnership

2015 May Meeting

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: RESEARCH COMPLIANCE RETREAT PLANNING

<b>POINT OF CONTACT</b>	Alexandra Albinak McKeown
<b>CHARGE</b>	
<b>WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES/ OUTCOMES/ PROGRESS TO DATE</b>	Research Compliance has been comprised of four subcommittees: Human Subjects Protections; Animal Care and Use; Conflict of Interest; and Export Controls. All four address federal guidance and regulations, as well as the "self-imposed" rules, which place burden on research. Outcomes include working with the Subawards group to establish a model COI policy and a federal clearing house, the human subjects practical guide, and the ongoing exempt wizard pilot. Research Compliance will be evaluating past, present and future and organizing accordingly. This will be the focus of an upcoming retreat.
<b>AGENDA / DISCUSSION POINTS FOR THIS MEETING</b>	
<b>KEY DECISIONS PENDING</b>	It was agreed that an in-person retreat should be held immediately before September's FDP meeting. It was also agreed that the agenda should include structural committee questions as well as discussions on hot topical issues in today's research compliance environment. Expected outcome of the retreat will be the identification of several possible pilots and demonstrations.
<b>PARTICIPATION</b>	A variety of faculty and administrative representatives attended this planning session. There was great interest in the subsequent retreat.
<b>MOVING FORWARD... KEY RISKS / ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>	There was overwhelming interest in the retreat. The attendance will need to be limited to ensure that there is time for detailed dialogue and development of actionable items.
<b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>	The focus of the meeting was retreat planning. Discussions took place to evaluate current committee status. Then we briefly discussed specifics, including: how best to reduce burden by involving a broader audience; the need for improved communications and dissemination of activities; the need to renew focus on COI and possibly working with PHS to develop a consistent training module; how to lead an effort to harmonize RCR training; the need to add additional committees, including a new data committee; how to address new export control regulations; and how to systematically use the faculty workload survey to conduct pilots and demonstrations.

**WEBSITE**

Minutes – FDP Open Government Session  
May 11, 2015  
1:00-2:15

Co-Chairs: David Curren (NIH)  
Richard Fenger (University of Washington)  
Additional Attendees: Rick Ikeda (NIH eRA)  
Mark Sweet (FDP ERA Subcommittee)  
Christopher Zeleznik (HHS DATA Act PMO)

- 1) Reminder of January, 2015 meeting's discussion
- 2) Report of data elements workgroups responding to OMB's questions
  - a. Information collected from 20 volunteers
  - b. Results included in FDP presentation. Highlights include
    - i. Institutions most concerned about elements they will be expected to report on.
    - ii. Selection of data standards should consider the size of institutions and ability of all to develop supporting systems that implement them.
    - iii. Institutions strongly encourage the enforcement of consistent use of data elements among Federal agencies.
- 3) Presentation of coming DATA Act pilot – "Pilot" starts 5/9
  - a. Not a typical system-based pilot but a series of DATA Act implementation efforts
    - i. Grants Information Gateway at Grants.gov
    - ii. Creation of "Open Dialogue" blog tool (coming soon)
    - iii. Creation of Common Data Elements Repository (CDER) Library
    - iv. Standardize Data Elements and embed in forms over time
    - v. Reduce burden for Federal Financial Report and Single Audit Act Reporting
  - b. Circle diagram: From presentation – This section generated some discussion including:
    - i. Intro from Chris Z from DHHS PMO
      1. Reduce burden
      2. Reduce duplication
      3. Looking to generate institutional feedback especially around challenges
    - ii. USA Spending – pulled up website and mentioned original FFATA 87 data elements vs recently reduced model of 54 elements
    - iii. DUNS – asked why DUNS is still main identifier. Some institution have many which prove to be very hard to manage (one example 142) How will the unique ID requirement in the data act help
    - iv. TAS/TAFS – might be helpful to understand "use" rather than just definition
    - v. Perf Site discussion – how to handle multiple sites discussed
    - vi. Multi-part elements like addresses with congressional district, country code, country name
    - vii. 1<sup>st</sup> phase to be closed but pilot and feedback is meant to be iterative with varying degrees of feedback participation

- 4) Future Activities:
  - a. Workgroup members will continue watching the DATA Act Collaboration Space (<http://fedspendingtransparency.github.io/dataelements/>) as new data elements are proposed. New ones are typically proposed each week with comment periods of 1-2 weeks.
  - b. Workgroup members are encouraged to provide comments on proposed data elements and join the discussion on each.
- 5) Session ended with a subset of attendees joining the follow-up Open Gov Breakout Working Session at 2:30.

Minutes – FDP Open Government Breakout Working Session  
May 11, 2015  
2:30-3:30

Co-Chairs: David Curren (NIH)  
Richard Fenger (University of Washington)

Additional Attendees: Rick Ikeda (NIH eRA)  
Mark Sweet (FDP ERA Subcommittee)  
Christopher Zeleznik (HHS DATA Act PMO)  
need to get sign up list form Bronda?

- 1) Reminder of discussion at the previous 1:00 Open Government session
- 2) Discussion- What do we want to focus on? Hit on the following?
  - a. Elements:
    - i. Open Dialouge Tool
    - ii. Grants.gov
    - iii. CEDR Library
    - iv. Data centric forms – Forms based on data elements
- 3) What does the data act apply to?
- 4) Walked through draft recommendation from Open Gov
- 5) Detailed walkthrough of Github Open Collaboration space
- 6) Discussion of all DATA elements proposed to date by OMB:
  - a. Definitions
  - b. Degree of change from existing data elements. Reviewed USA spending (FFATA) elements 87 elements reduced to 54
  - c. Potential impact on recipients
  - d. Returned to “why we are here discussion” hitting on comment from group on following topics
  - e. Burden reduction
  - f. Data elements repeated multiple times in multiple places
  - g. SEFA Single audit requirements (state reporting) vs Data Act (Fed reporting)
  - h. Where will universities be in the end?
  - i. Manually entered status vs financial reporting vs project status
  - j. GRIP proved to be a separate project from separate financial reporting
  - k. “get off G Acct”
  - l. Sub accounts – why does fed not do all reporting for us?
  - m. Answer finance reporting vs project reporting
- 7) Future Activities:
  - a. Develop Open Gov tracking document for workgroup members
  - b. Workgroup members will contribute – need to get sign up list form Bronda?
  - c. Next agenda: Status and 5 things we can influence
    1. Burden
    2. Data elements multiple times
    3. And so on
  - ii. Lori and Chris from DHHS PMO