

FDP Update

- John Marburger, Director OSTP

“The Federal Demonstration Project is one of a very small number of effective programs to improve government processes. It has produced the defining models for ‘e-government,’ and saved countless hours of time for us bureaucrats as well as for principal investigators.”

10/18/2005

SRA

FDP Mission

Faculty and administrators talk face-to-face with decision-makers from agencies that sponsor and regulate \$15 Billion in research

10/18/2005

SRA

The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is an association of federal agencies, academic research institutions with administrative, faculty and technical representation, and research policy organizations that work to streamline the administration of federally sponsored research. FDP members of all sectors cooperate in identifying, testing, and implementing new, more effective ways of managing the more than \$15 Billion in federal research grants. The goal of improving the productivity of research without compromising its stewardship has benefits for the entire nation.

The FDP uniquely offers a forum for members to work collaboratively with federal agency officials to improve the national research enterprise. At its regular meetings, faculty and administrators talk face-to-face with decision-makers from agencies that sponsor and regulate research. They hold spirited, frank discussions, identify problems, and develop action plans for change. Then – again working jointly – they test the new ways of doing things in the real world before putting them into effect

Faculty Survey

- Initial Faculty Survey 1990
 - FDP Initiative of ‘Expanded Authority’ saved faculty time
 - 90% of this time refocused on Scholarly Activity
 - Concern that other tasks such as IRB, IACUC, Research Safety and training requirements would consume this savings
- Faculty Survey 2005 in Process to 40,000 at 75 Institutions

10/18/2005

SRA

In 1990 the FDP surveyed faculty to evaluate the worth of the “expanded authorities” that had recently been negotiated between the FDP universities, participating federal agencies and the OMB. The principal focus of the survey was to determine whether changes in the regulations affecting prior approvals, pre-award costs, no-cost extensions, and the carryover of unexpended funds had saved faculty time and whether such a time savings had been re-invested in research activities.

Respondents to the survey indicating that the new, more flexible policies saved researchers significant time, of which about 90% was refocused at scholarly activity and of that, 73% of the liberated time was spent directly on research. These observations implied that the research productivity of FDP faculty would be increased by such changes in federal grant policies. However, anecdotal comments from some of the surveyed faculty indicated that much of the freed-up time that resulted from the implementation of the “expanded authorities” was likely to be re-allocated to other research administrative tasks, like IRB, IACUC and research safety issues to mention just a few.

SF424 R&R and Grants.gov

- Standard form for submission of grant applications to the Federal Government
- Did not include key information:
 - Biographical information
 - Current and Pending Support
 - Standard budget categories found in research proposals
 - Compliance information
 - Demographic Data

10/18/2005

SRA

The SF 424 (R&R)

The Government-wide Grant Application – SF 424

Standard form for submission of grant applications to the Federal Government

Was developed for use in State and Local programs

Did not include key information:

Biographical information

Current and Pending Support

Standard budget categories found in research proposals

Compliance information

Demographic Data

The SF 424 alone would not work for research and related applications

Combining the Cover SF 424 with research specific elements made the most sense

Forms and Associated instructions for completion of each data element.

SF 424 (R&R) Components

Cover

Pages 1 and 2 – (Includes certification and assurance language)

Project/Performance Site Location(s) and other Project Information

Senior/Key Person Profile(s)

Budget

Total Funds Requested; and

Total Federal & Non-Federal Funds

R&R Working Group just provided Grants.gov PMO with the first programmatic application for use with the SBIR/STTR programs

NSF will include other forms such as:

Cover Page

CheckList

NSF-Specific Optional Forms

Deviation Authorization

Suggested Reviewers

FastLane System Registration

Functionality not available in Grants.gov

SF424 R&R and Grants.gov (Cont)

- SF 424 (R&R) Components
 - Cover
 - Pages 1 and 2 – (Includes certification and assurance language)
 - Project/Performance Site Location(s) and other Project Information
 - Senior/Key Person Profile(s)
 - Budget
 - Total Funds Requested; and
 - Total Federal & Non-Federal Funds

10/18/2005

SRA

The SF 424 (R&R)

The Government-wide Grant Application – SF 424

Standard form for submission of grant applications to the Federal Government

Was developed for use in State and Local programs

Did not include key information:

Biographical information

Current and Pending Support

Standard budget categories found in research proposals

Compliance information

Demographic Data

The SF 424 alone would not work for research and related applications

Combining the Cover SF 424 with research specific elements made the most sense

Forms and Associated instructions for completion of each data element.

SF 424 (R&R) Components

Cover

Pages 1 and 2 – (Includes certification and assurance language)

Project/Performance Site Location(s) and other Project Information

Senior/Key Person Profile(s)

Budget

Total Funds Requested; and

Total Federal & Non-Federal Funds

R&R Working Group just provided Grants.gov PMO with the first programmatic application for use with the SBIR/STTR programs

NSF will include other forms such as:

Cover Page

CheckList

NSF-Specific Optional Forms

Deviation Authorization

Suggested Reviewers

FastLane System Registration

Functionality not available in Grants.gov

Grants.gov

- 2005 Information
 - 15,600 Submissions Received
 - 24 of 26 Agencies have posted
 - 1,400 Agency Postings
- 2006 Goals
 - 100% of all funding opportunities
 - 45,000 Submissions
 - Mac/Unix/Linux support
 - Architecture upgrades to meet deadlines

10/18/2005

SRA

Grants.gov

- Usage Highlights
- FY 2006 Goals
- Grants Executive Board
- Architecture Upgrades
- Find & Apply Merger
- Applicant System-to-System

Grants.gov Usage Highlights

- Over 15,600 Electronic Submissions Received – 15,000 Performance Goal Met!!!!
- Registered Users Exceeds 17,000
- 1,400+ Agency Postings
- 24 out of 26 Agencies Posted on Apply –Almost 100%
- NASA & IMLS Post First Application Packages
- FIND
- 1.5M Hits per Week
- 1.1M Emails per Week

FY 2006 Agency Grants.gov Goals

- Post 100% of Funding Opportunities on Find
- Post 75% of Find Opportunities on Apply –2500 Packages
- 45,000 Electronic Submissions –Agency Submission Goals will Follow
- Reset Counter to “0”on October 1, 2005
- Due 1stQuarter FY 2006
- Ramp Up Schedule
- Outreach Plan

Grants Executive Board

- Membership
- Includes all 26 Grant-making Agencies
- Grants Policy Committee Chairs Ex-Officio Members
- Increased Responsibility
- Governance Body for Grants Management Line of Business
- Rotating Chair –Jerry Fralick, DOJ (6/30/06)
- Approved 2007 Grants.gov Budget & Funding Algorithm

Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB)

- **Basis for Effort**
 - PL 106-107
 - President's Management Agenda
 - E-Gov Act
- **OMB Role**
 - Issue guidance to grant-making Agencies:
 - Standard format for Grant Announcements
 - Use of Grants.gov FIND and APPLY
 - Budget Guidance

10/18/2005

SRA

Grants Management Line of Business Basis

- . Graduation of E-Gov Initiatives
- . Agency implementation and migration plans
- . Agency adoption of E-Gov, LoB, and SmartBuy Initiatives
- . Public Law 106-107
- . President's Management Agenda
- . E-Gov Act
- . Federal Enterprise Architecture

P.L. 106-107 Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act calls for establishing:

- "a common application and reporting system"
 - a common application for multiple Federal financial assistance programs
 - uniform administrative rules for federal financial assistance programs across different federal agencies
 - an interagency process for addressing—
 - ways to streamline and simplify federal financial assistance administrative procedures and reporting requirements
 - improved interagency and intergovernmental coordination of information collection and sharing of data
 - Improvements in the timeliness, completeness, and quality of information received by Federal agencies

OMB's Role

- Issue guidance to grant-making Agencies:
 - Grant Management Policies, examples include:
- Standard format for Grant Announcements
- Use of Grants.gov FIND and APPLY
- Budget Guidance
- Funding for E-Gov and LoB initiatives
- Utilization Goals for Grants.gov
- Agency E-Gov Implementation and Alignment Plans:
 - Identified specific implementation phases for each initiative
 - Asked agencies to specifically identify target dates for completion of these implementation phases
 - list of legacy systems that should align to the initiatives

GMLoB Achievements in Streamlining

- Developed a vision to streamline the agency-facing business processes and systems that support grants management.
- Defined an operating model for the grant community to process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services.
- Identified a "consortia-based" approach to execute the operating model and achieve the goals of the initiative; the consortia approach aligns agency work teams (consortia) around shared business centers

Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) (Cont)

- OMB Role (Cont)
 - Funding for E-Gov and LoB initiatives
 - Utilization Goals for Grants.gov
 - Agency E-Gov Implementation and Alignment Plans:
 - Identify specific implementation phases for each initiative
 - Asked agencies to specifically identify target dates for completion of these implementation phases
 - Identify legacy systems that should align to the initiatives

10/18/2005

SRA

Grants Management Line of Business Basis

- . Graduation of E-Gov Initiatives
- . Agency implementation and migration plans
- . Agency adoption of E-Gov, LoB, and SmartBuy Initiatives
- . Public Law 106-107
- . President's Management Agenda
- . E-Gov Act
- . Federal Enterprise Architecture

P.L. 106-107 Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act calls for establishing:

- "a common application and reporting system"
 - a common application for multiple Federal financial assistance programs
 - uniform administrative rules for federal financial assistance programs across different federal agencies
 - an interagency process for addressing—
 - ways to streamline and simplify federal financial assistance administrative procedures and reporting requirements
 - improved interagency and intergovernmental coordination of information collection and sharing of data
 - Improvements in the timeliness, completeness, and quality of information received by Federal agencies

OMB's Role

- Issue guidance to grant-making Agencies:
 - Grant Management Policies, examples include:
- Standard format for Grant Announcements
- Use of Grants.gov FIND and APPLY
- Budget Guidance
- Funding for E-Gov and LoB initiatives
- Utilization Goals for Grants.gov
- Agency E-Gov Implementation and Alignment Plans:
 - Identified specific implementation phases for each initiative
 - Asked agencies to specifically identify target dates for completion of these implementation phases
 - list of legacy systems that should align to the initiatives

GMLoB Achievements in Streamlining

- Developed a vision to streamline the agency-facing business processes and systems that support grants management.
- Defined an operating model for the grant community to process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services.
- Identified a "consortia-based" approach to execute the operating model and achieve the goals of the initiative; the consortia approach aligns agency work teams (consortia) around shared business centers

Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) (Cont)

- GMLoB Effort in Streamlining
- Develop a vision to streamline the agency-facing business processes and systems that support grants management.
- Define an operating model for the grant community to process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services.
- Identify a “consortia-based” approach to execute the operating model and achieve the goals of the initiative

10/18/2005

SRA

Grants Management Line of Business Basis

- . Graduation of E-Gov Initiatives
- . Agency implementation and migration plans
- . Agency adoption of E-Gov, LoB, and SmartBuy Initiatives
- . Public Law 106-107
- . President’s Management Agenda
- . E-Gov Act
- . Federal Enterprise Architecture

P.L. 106-107 Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act calls for establishing:

- “a common application and reporting system
- a common application for multiple Federal financial assistance programs
- uniform administrative rules for federal financial assistance programs across different federal agencies
- an interagency process for addressing—
- ways to streamline and simplify federal financial assistance administrative procedures and reporting requirements
- improved interagency and intergovernmental coordination of information collection and sharing of data
- Improvements in the timeliness, completeness, and quality of information received by Federal agencies

OMB’s Role

- Issue guidance to grant-making Agencies:
 - Grant Management Policies, examples include:
- Standard format for Grant Announcements
- Use of Grants.gov FIND and APPLY
- Budget Guidance
- Funding for E-Gov and LoB initiatives
- Utilization Goals for Grants.gov
- Agency E-Gov Implementation and Alignment Plans:
 - Identified specific implementation phases for each initiative
 - Asked agencies to specifically identify target dates for completion of these implementation phases
- list of legacy systems that should align to the initiatives

GMLoB Achievements in Streamlining

- Developed a vision to streamline the agency-facing business processes and systems that support grants management.
- Defined an operating model for the grant community to process grants in a decentralized way using common business processes supported by shared technical support services.
- Identified a “consortia-based” approach to execute the operating model and achieve the goals of the initiative; the consortia approach aligns agency work teams (consortia) around shared business centers

NIH Electronic Receipt

- By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:
 - Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant applications
 - Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set
 - SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))
 - SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

10/18/2005

SRA

NIH's Electronic Receipt Goal

By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:

- Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant applications
- Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set
- SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))
- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

Announced in the NIH Guide, Aug. 19, 2005:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html>

Why transition to electronic receipt?

- It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!
- Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection z Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award
- Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools
- Electronic validations improve data quality z Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort z Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs z Grant image is clearer and in color

Why transition to SF424 family of forms?

- SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies
- Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.
- Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.
- SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications
- It's the law...

Why now?

- Its been a long time coming
- OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in "Find" on Grants.gov "Apply"
- The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

NIH's Transition Strategy

- NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism
- ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms
- Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers

NIH Electronic Receipt (Cont)

- Why transition to SF424 family of forms?
 - SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies
 - Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.
 - Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.
 - SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications
 - It's the law...

10/18/2005

SRA

NIH's Electronic Receipt Goal

By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:

Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant applications
Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set

- SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))
- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

Announced in the NIH Guide, Aug. 19, 2005:
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html>

Why transition to electronic receipt?

- It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!
- Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection z Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award
- Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools
- Electronic validations improve data quality z Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort z Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs z Grant image is clearer and in color

Why transition to SF424 family of forms?

- SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies
- Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.
- Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.
- SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications
- It's the law...

Why now?

- Its been a long time coming
- OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in "Find" on Grants.gov "Apply"
- The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

NIH's Transition Strategy

- NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism
- ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms
- Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers

NIH Electronic Receipt (Cont)

- Why now?
 - Its been a long time coming
 - OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in “Find” on Grants.gov “Apply”
 - The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

10/18/2005

SRA

NIH's Electronic Receipt Goal

By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:

Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant applications
Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set

- SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))
- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

Announced in the NIH Guide, Aug. 19, 2005:
<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html>

Why transition to electronic receipt?

- It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!
- Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection z Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award
- Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools
- Electronic validations improve data quality z Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort z Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs z Grant image is clearer and in color

Why transition to SF424 family of forms?

- SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies
- Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.
- Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.
- SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications
- It's the law...

Why now?

- Its been a long time coming
- OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in “Find” on Grants.gov “Apply”
- The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

NIH's Transition Strategy

- NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism
- ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms
- Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers

NIH Electronic Receipt (Cont)

- NIH's Transition Strategy
 - NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism
 - ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms
 - Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers
 - NIH will announce plan to transition mechanisms in NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts
 - Funding Opportunity Announcements will be posted in Grants.gov "Apply", generally 2 months before the submission date.

10/18/2005

SRA

NIH's Electronic Receipt Goal

By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:

Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant publications

Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set

- SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))

- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

Announced in the NIH Guide, Aug. 19, 2005:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html>

Why transition to electronic receipt?

-It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!

-Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection z Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award

-Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools

-Electronic validations improve data quality z Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort z Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs z Grant image is clearer and in color

Why transition to SF424 family of forms?

-SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies

-Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.

-Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.

-SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications

-It's the law...

Why now?

-Its been a long time coming

-OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in "Find" on Grants.gov "Apply"

-The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

NIH's Transition Strategy

-NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism

-ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms

-Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers

-NIH will announce plan to transition mechanisms in NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts

NIH Electronic Receipt (Cont)

- Why transition to electronic receipt?
 - It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!
 - Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award
 - Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools
 - Electronic validations improve data quality
 - Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs
 - Grant image is clearer and in color

10/18/2005

SRA

NIH's Electronic Receipt Goal

By the end of May 2007, NIH plans to:

Require electronic submission through Grants.gov for all NIH grant publications

Transition from the PHS 398 application form to SF424 family of forms data set

- SF424 Research and Research-Related (SF424 (R&R))

- SF424 Discretionary (of limited use for NIH)

Announced in the NIH Guide, Aug. 19, 2005:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-05-067.html>

Why transition to electronic receipt?

-It benefits our applicant community, creates efficiencies, and makes our jobs easier!

-Eliminates the burden of paper-based data collection z Resulting efficiencies may allow NIH to shorten the cycle from application receipt to award

-Electronic submission creates a comprehensive repository of data that can be mined by knowledge management and other tools

-Electronic validations improve data quality z Savings of >200,000,000 pieces of paper/year (estimated) and countless hours of human effort z Reductions of scanning, printing, and data-entry costs z Grant image is clearer and in color

Why transition to SF424 family of forms?

-SF424 consolidates forms currently used by Federal grant-making agencies

-Applicants can use standard forms regardless of the program or agency to which they are applying.

-Reduces administrative burden on the Federal grants community.

-SF424 (R&R) is the government-wide data set for research grant applications

-It's the law...

Why now?

-Its been a long time coming

-OMB has set the following FY 2006 Goal for Agencies: Post 75% of Funding Opportunities in "Find" on Grants.gov "Apply"

-The PHS 398 OMB clearance expires in September, 2007

NIH's Transition Strategy

-NIH will transition by individual research program/funding mechanism

-ALL applications in response to these announcements for transitioned mechanisms will require electronic submission through Grants.gov on the 424 family of forms

-Mechanisms not yet transitioned will continue to require submission on PHS 398 on paper or through service providers

-NIH will announce plan to transition mechanisms in NIH Guide for Grants and Contracts

Subrecipient Monitoring

- Three options for subrecipient monitoring:
 1. Use Federal Audit Clearinghouse to find subrecipients & A-133 audit findings
 2. Post scanned A-133 Audit to local website and send out e-mail messages to primes
 3. Create an A-133 Audit Registry online, beginning in pilot-phase on FDP web site

10/18/2005

SRA

FDP – Subrecipient Monitoring Pilot

Three options for subrecipient monitoring:

Use Federal Audit Clearinghouse to find subrecipients & A-133 audit findings
Post scanned A-133 Audit to local website and send out e-mail messages to primes
Create an A-133 Audit Registry online, beginning in pilot-phase on FDP web site

Suggested procedures:

1. FDP member schools annually submit summary audit information to FDP at time of A-133 filing
2. FDP to maintain registry web site using school-supplied information
3. Schools to include a URL for their scanned A-133 audit in pdf if available
4. FDP registry would indicate prime grantee and programs (CFDA#) affected by each subrecipient with findings
5. Prime grantee schools would view audit results of their subrecipients in the FDP subrecipient registry table that is sortable, scrollable, easy-to-use
6. Primes would target their subrecipient monitoring & audit follow-up procedures to a defined set of subrecipients having audit findings
7. Audit registry would substitute for annual letter & report exchanging among the many entities as well as review of Clearinghouse data
8. Negative assurance would be nearly instantaneous

A-133 Audit Registry next steps:

Further develop items for data collection, restricted to R&D
Include contact person(s) for each entity
Consider two levels of disclosure:

- program-specific
- systemic

Ultimately, get OMB/federal agency adoption

Subrecipient Monitoring (Cont)

- Suggested procedures:
 1. FDP member schools annually submit summary audit information to FDP at time of A-133 filing
 2. FDP to maintain registry web site using school-supplied information
 3. Schools to include a URL for their scanned A-133 audit in pdf if available
 4. FDP registry would indicate prime grantee and programs (CFDA#) affected by each subrecipient with findings
 5. Prime grantee schools would view audit results of their subrecipients in the FDP subrecipient registry table that is sortable, scrollable, easy-to-use
 6. Primes would target their subrecipient monitoring & audit follow-up procedures to a defined set of subrecipients having audit findings
 7. Audit registry would substitute for annual letter & report exchanging among the many entities as well as review of Clearinghouse data
 8. Negative assurance would be nearly instantaneous

10/18/2005

SRA

FDP – Subrecipient Monitoring Pilot

Three options for subrecipient monitoring:

Use Federal Audit Clearinghouse to find subrecipients & A-133 audit findings

Post scanned A-133 Audit to local website and send out e-mail messages to primes

Create an A-133 Audit Registry online, beginning in pilot-phase on FDP web site

Suggested procedures:

1. FDP member schools annually submit summary audit information to FDP at time of A-133 filing
2. FDP to maintain registry web site using school-supplied information
3. Schools to include a URL for their scanned A-133 audit in pdf if available
4. FDP registry would indicate prime grantee and programs (CFDA#) affected by each subrecipient with findings
5. Prime grantee schools would view audit results of their subrecipients in the FDP subrecipient registry table that is sortable, scrollable, easy-to-use
6. Primes would target their subrecipient monitoring & audit follow-up procedures to a defined set of subrecipients having audit findings
7. Audit registry would substitute for annual letter & report exchanging among the many entities as well as review of Clearinghouse data
8. Negative assurance would be nearly instantaneous

A-133 Audit Registry next steps:

Further develop items for data collection, restricted to R&D

Include contact person(s) for each entity

Consider two levels of disclosure:

-program-specific

-systemic

Ultimately, get OMB/federal agency adoption

Financial Reporting Subcommittee

- Seeking to pilot test new Federal Financial Reporting (FFR) form, combines SF269 and SF270 (Mike Nelson, NOAA is contact)
- Review of NIH Financial Reporting requirements: on hold until after FFR pilot testing
- Several institutions working off line to look at best practices for financial closeout of awards.

10/18/2005

SRA

Electronic Grants Business Forum (EGBF)

- A subcommittee of the FDP ERA charged with
 - creating a forum for discussion of implementation issues among FDP institutional members, federal agencies and Grants.gov staff
- Initiatives:
 - Organizational registration using Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) and Central Contractor Registry (CCR) and the various transactions
 - Faculty profiles (utilizing previous FDP and federal agency work on professional profiles)
 - System to System (S2S) issues & enhancements

10/18/2005

SRA

Electronic Grants Business Forum

- Identification of Grants.gov as single 'Portal' for applications
 - Conversation between Dick Keogh (Rhode Island), Becky Spitzgo (Grants.gov) and Ron Splittgerber (Colorado State)
 - Be careful what you ask for!
- Communication channel between FDP, agencies and Grants.gov
 - Initial meeting following May 2005 FDP
 - Follow-up meeting July 2005
 - Next meeting today following FDP
- No name to EGBF Electronic Grants Business Forum
- Quick Win Laundry List
 - National User Profile
 - DUNS/CCR Registration Issues
 - Notice of Award
 - Line of Business (Payment Portal, Expand S2S)
- Federal Co-Chair Bob MacDonald, USDA
- FDP Co-Chair Ron Splittgerber, Colorado State
-
- FDP Committee Members
 - David Wright, HHS
 - Steve Dowdy, MIT
 - Gunta Lidars, Rochester
 - Dan Hofherr, NSF
 - David Robinson, Faculty Rep OHSU
 - Becky Spitzgo & Grants.gov team
 - NGP Reps – Tony Cavataio, Sandy Swab

EGBF Focus

- A subcommittee of the FDP ERA charged with creating a forum for discussion of implementation issues among FDP institutional members, federal agencies and Grants.gov staff
- Initiatives:
 - Organizational registration using Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) and Central Contractor Registry (CCR) and the various transactions using this process.

DUNS / CCR for Peer Reviewers

- 2004 OMA report recommended:
 - Funds from Research Management Services (RMS) instead of Extramural Program budget line.
 - Flat rate reimbursement to reviewers
 - Electronic funds transfer for reimbursement

10/18/2005

SRA

Use of DUNS / CCR for NIH Peer Reviewers

Background

- Scientific Review Evaluation Award (SREA) funds have been used to reimburse travel, lodging, per diem, and honoraria for Initial Review Group (IRG) and Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) members for over 50 years.
- SREA funds are awarded to the Chairpersons (which is sometimes why these awards are referred to as Chairman's Grants).
- Because NIH staff are substantially involved in monitoring the expenditure of funds, SREAs are awarded as cooperative agreements
- Total annual program cost is for FY 2005 is nearly \$47M, of which approximately \$12M is for travel costs (airlines).

SREA Management Study

2004 Office of Management Assessment (OMA) report concluded that the Peer Review Reimbursement Program:

- Lack of internal controls, high risk for waste, fraud or abuse
- Data is not reliable, complete, or accurate
- Could operate more effectively and efficiently

2004 OMA report recommended:

- Funds from Research Management Services (RMS) instead of Extramural Program budget line.
- Flat rate reimbursement to reviewers
- Electronic funds transfer for reimbursement

Current Reimbursement Process

- NIH Scientific Review Administrators (SRAs) negotiate with local hotels for room pricing and work with NIH support staff for review meeting logistics.
- NIH deposits funds from SREA grants into the NIH Credit Union in 53 separate accounts.
- Center for Scientific Review (CSR) issues payments for most NIH Institutes and Centers (ICs) from these accounts.
- Reviewers incur lodging, meals, and other costs as out-of-pocket expenses and then must submit reimbursement vouchers and receipts for payment.
- Vouchers are reviewed by NIH staff and appropriate charges are approved.
- Checks are mailed to reviewers to reimburse them for travel costs and honorarium.

Major Changes Effective October 1, 2005

-Funds no longer from extramural grant line, but from research management services (RMS). A budget adjustment in FY 2006 of \$55 million from Extramural Funds to RMS was approved in NIH's Congressional Justification.

DUNS / CCR for Peer Reviewers

- Major Changes Effective October 1, 2005
 - Funds no longer from extramural grant line, but from research management services (RMS)
 - HHS Events Management Contract to provide meeting logistics, hotel rooms, and travel arrangements.
 - Flat rate of reimbursement to reviewers.
 - NIH staff review of vouchers no longer necessary (only for exceptions).
 - Instead of using check writing system, NIH Office of Financial Management (OFM) will make electronic payments to reviewers through DUNS / CCR

10/18/2005

SRA

Use of DUNS / CCR for NIH Peer Reviewers

Background

- Scientific Review Evaluation Award (SREA) funds have been used to reimburse travel, lodging, per diem, and honoraria for Initial Review Group (IRG) and Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) members for over 50 years.
- SREA funds are awarded to the Chairpersons (which is sometimes why these awards are referred to as Chairman's Grants).
- Because NIH staff are substantially involved in monitoring the expenditure of funds, SREAs are awarded as cooperative agreements
- Total annual program cost is for FY 2005 is nearly \$47M, of which approximately \$12M is for travel costs (airlines).

SREA Management Study

2004 Office of Management Assessment (OMA) report concluded that the Peer Review Reimbursement Program:

- Lack of internal controls, high risk for waste, fraud or abuse
- Data is not reliable, complete, or accurate
- Could operate more effectively and efficiently

2004 OMA report recommended:

- Funds from Research Management Services (RMS) instead of Extramural Program budget line.
- Flat rate reimbursement to reviewers
- Electronic funds transfer for reimbursement

Current Reimbursement Process

- NIH Scientific Review Administrators (SRAs) negotiate with local hotels for room pricing and work with NIH support staff for review meeting logistics.
- NIH deposits funds from SREA grants into the NIH Credit Union in 53 separate accounts.
- Center for Scientific Review (CSR) issues payments for most NIH Institutes and Centers (ICs) from these accounts.
- Reviewers incur lodging, meals, and other costs as out-of-pocket expenses and then must submit reimbursement vouchers and receipts for payment.
- Vouchers are reviewed by NIH staff and appropriate charges are approved.
- Checks are mailed to reviewers to reimburse them for travel costs and honorarium.

Major Changes Effective October 1, 2005

-Funds no longer from extramural grant line, but from research management services (RMS). A budget adjustment in FY 2006 of \$55 million from Extramural Funds to RMS was approved in NIH's Congressional Justification.