

The National Academies

Federal Demonstration Partnership

September 18-19, 2006

Monday, September 18, 2006

NANCY WRAY: We have a pretty full meeting this time around, and so welcome. Welcome to the September 2006 FDP meeting. There are lots of activities today, and I do have a few announcements. I hope you all, first, had a great summer. Do you remember it? It was sometime between June and September. I don't know where it went, but I hope you all had an enjoyable time.

I do want to bring to your attention a loss to the organization. Scott Blackwood, who had been co-chairing the financial reporting group and been an active member of the FDP as well as other national organizations, passed away on August 27th. He had been ill and was struggling with his illness, and he finally succumbed at home and with friends around him. We give our thoughts to the folks at UNC, and FDP is going to send a letter and a contribution to UNC in his name.

Another logistical point, or a logistical point, the ERA session that was scheduled for, yeah, let me back that up. The ERI session, the Emerging Research Institute session, that will be moved. It's scheduled for 3:45 to 5:00 on Monday. It's going to move into the ERA session. It seemed like both of the groups were talking about similar topics, so we decided to combine their sessions. So if you look on your agenda, the 3:45 to 5:00 session for the ERI, Emerging Research Institute, will move in with the ERA session at that same time.

I also want to announce that it's that time of year, and in the next month or so you will be receiving invoices for dues for the next year. So we just wanted to alert you and to be watchful for those invoices coming out. I do also want to announce we have some changes on the Executive Committee. Steve Dowdy, who has been a longtime member of the Executive Committee representing the ERA track, is stepping down, and Ron Splittgerber will be taking his place on the Executive Committee and co-chairing the ERA committee.

The second announcement is Beth Mora has also announced that she'll be stepping down from the Executive Committee, as well as probably stepping back from her activities in the FDP. She has been named acting chief financial officer of Harvard University, and so she's a little busy right now. So she doesn't think that she could really provide the leadership and the time to the FDP that she believes it needs. So she is stepping down, and we will be, Debbie Rafi and I and others will be meeting over the next several weeks to come up with a replacement.

Another thing I want to bring to your attention is that we're thinking about, and I think I briefly mentioned this before, a celebration of our 20th anniversary when we kick

off Phase V. It's September 2008 we'll be 20 years in existence, and I think that's quite a milestone. I will be talking with the Florida institutions because as FDP started as the Florida Demonstration Partnership and we've had most of our kickoffs for different, for the new phases in Florida, I would like to continue that tradition.

In addition, we will be setting up a planning committee, and I would really appreciate those that would be interested in participating stepping forward and volunteering to be on that committee. We want to really reach out to some of what we'll call our alumni and early founders and try to get on their calendars early. So I don't think it's too early to start the wheels in motion for this large celebration. Please feel free to e-mail David Wright if you are interested in participating.

I also want to say a special welcome to our new attendees. I believe many of you attended the orientation session this morning, and I hope that that was helpful. We really appreciate your feedback to know how we can either improve that session so that it is beneficial to new attendees to have a sense of how the meeting is structured, where to go, and how to be active within the organization.

The other announcement that I wanted to make is that we've had a lot of discussion about the meeting books and how beneficial they are to people and how many we recycle, how many sit on shelves, people that never look at them. So and due to the, we've done a cost analysis, and now we're trying to do, understand a cost-benefit analysis. So we may be trying something different at the next meeting, and we will appreciate your comments. If you have strong feelings now one way or the other, on your meeting evaluation form, you could enter some comments.

But we thought we would try some different look and feel for the next meeting and then expect feedback on that too. I think the binders are costly, and the production of the material is going up. And so utilizing Web or other kinds of, other means might be a way to go in the future. So just to alert you and to get your feedback, what is helpful.

Okay. I think that takes care of all of the messages at this point in time. I think we're going to rearrange things a little bit and go with the election. Joanna and Donna, if you would do that at this point, and we'll come back to the recognition awards.

JOANNA ROM: Good morning.

DONNA HELM: We don't have our costumes and our hats with us. We apologize. We had so much fun in Seattle, we just kind of left them there so Seattle could have even more fun. We have an interesting election process this year. We have an incumbent candidate who is running again for chairman, and we will give her a chance to make remarks after we've had our two candidates for the faculty co-chair to speak.

And so I'd like, we have them, we're going to do this all in alphabetical order, and so, David, where are you sitting? We'll have you do your presentation. Do you have slides? Okay. And then after that, we'll have Sara Rockwell speak, and then we'll come back and we'll have a chat and we'll talk about who is next on the runway.

DAVID ROBINSON: Well, good morning. I'd like to say finally I made the platform of the National Academy of Sciences. It's probably the only way I'll get to the platform of the National Academy of Sciences. I'm David Robinson. I'm from Oregon Health and

Science University, as the slide says. I'm an assistant professor there, but I'm also the vice provost for academic technology.

As those of you who have already read my vision and background statements might already know I'm a man of few words, so I'm going to try and make my comments as brief as possible this morning. For those of you who have not read the three pages of eight-point font on pages that actually exceed NIH guidelines for margins, you were the lucky ones and clearly have got something better to do with your life than read kind of my musings and drivel.

I'd also like, I actually provided a link in my background statement to a Web page that shows more information about my academic background. Well, that link's broken and has been since I put it on my background. So the page not found is not indicative of my academic background, more of my inability to get the Web page up fast enough. I think probably with the increased academic burden that I've been under over the last few years, my graduate student will probably think mentor not found is a better message for your Web browser to give you about rather than page not found.

But seriously, I was actually quite dumbfounded and shocked when I was approached to do this particular position or at least run for this position. I actually thought they can't mean me, I think was the first reaction I had. I thought, but then again, I thought, how many other people with strange foreign accents do we have on the Faculty Steering Committee, or Faculty Committee. I'm the only one with a strange foreign accent, or maybe I'm the only one with a normal accent. Everybody else has got strange foreign accents.

But seriously, well, I don't know how seriously, I think the FDP is an extremely important entity, that it has had a significant impact on the lives of research and my research colleagues over the last few years, 20 years almost, 18 years. Unfortunately, the vast majority of my colleagues at least, and I'm not sure it's the same at your universities, do not really understand what FDP does or is or what is achieved over the last 20 years for them. I mean, there's some pretty significant accomplishments that I don't think they're attributed to the FDP by our colleagues.

I think this highlights the important gap between research and administration at our institutions, as well as the faculty that work there. In addition to all the other ideas I actually talk about in my lengthy vision statement, if you're not asleep having read it, one of the things I would also like to push towards over the next two years is a greater communication between the faculty and the research administrations.

I truly believe amount of burden, both institutional and federal, would be significantly reduced if the faculty understood what the compliance issues were, what the rules and regulations were. In fact, if they had a better appreciation of those difficulties that the research administration deal with on a day-to-day basis, they may be more willing to work actively to formulate solutions that, while keeping us friendly with the auditors, also don't increase the burden as significantly if we just let the research administrators to do it on their own.

I think the research administrators also benefit from a better understanding of what it's like to work in the trenches. Often, you know . . . come out at universities and the researchers all sit down and go, why am I filling out six more forms for no apparent reason? And I think they don't fully appreciate the time and energy it takes to fill out those forms, whether they're institutionally driven or federally driven.

So I think in addition, as I said, to the things I've mentioned in my statement, the FDP could really start concentrating on doing faculty outreach over the next two years. Faculty outreach, we do a reasonably good job to the faculty here, but I think also create materials that will be good faculty outreach to member institutions and try and get deeper beyond the faculty representatives at FDP.

I think a truly empowered faculty nationwide could be a powerful force in helping to enact the changes in the processes that are presently keeping it from doing the job it does best, and that's actually doing the research we're trained to do. I'd be honored and humbled to serve as the faculty co-chair of the FDP, and thank you all for the opportunity to run for this position.

SARA ROCKWELL: Sorry. I'm attempting to avoid tripping over presents that are hidden behind the podium. Thank you very much. It's a surprise and an honor to be standing up here, standing for election as chair of the Faculty Committee of the FDP. I must say that I am surprised because I think some of the things that I have said over the years as a faculty member at the FDP would have absolutely precluded my ever being invited to this podium, but apparently it didn't work.

For those of you who don't know me, I am Sara Rockwell. I am a professor of therapeutic radiology and pharmacology at Yale University. I view my primary job as being a faculty member. I do research in radiation biology related to cancer therapy, and I teach medical students, graduate students, residents, and some undergraduates in radiation biology and pharmacology.

I think in that I represent the faculty, despite the fact that for the last few years I have also held an administrative position with part of my time as director of the University's Office of Faculty Affairs, Office of Scientific Affairs. Excuse me. I managed to avoid the Office of Faculty Affairs.

I still get nervous when I talk, in case any of you had not noticed that. I think one of the things that the faculty at the FDP must do is to articulate the needs and the viewpoint of the faculty members at their institutions. The view of the faculty, of what they do and what they should do, is often very different from the view of the administrators and the view of the agencies.

As we look at the realm of compliance, the agencies see very clearly what they need to fulfill the mission of their agency in terms of ensuring the ethics and integrity of research and education. The administrators from the schools see the impact of this on their institutional infrastructure and their institutional procedures. Unfortunately, what the faculty member sees, as he or she sits in his or her lab and classroom, is a plethora of very different requirements, procedures, small administrative burdens, and large administrative burdens that filter down with no obvious connection to ensuring the integrity of research and education.

That became very clear as we looked at the Faculty Burden Survey, and we realized that the impression that we as individuals had was true, that the faculty actually was spending almost 40 percent of their nominal research time on research administration rather than on research.

What the faculty do at home is to grumble about this. I'm sure the faculty members in the room know that. I think some of the administrators have probably also heard us grumble and gripe and moan and groan. But it's usually in an isolated and

incoherent sense where we approach one administrator about one problem or one form that we find burdensome.

What we have not articulated is the fact that the faculty at most institutions absolutely believe that their work must be done with great ethics, with high integrity, and with accountability. But that, we often do not see the connection between this and the individual compliance documents and procedures which we must fill out. The faculty is in the position to be able to identify those burdens of administration which either seem disconnected from their intent or which seem unnecessarily burdensome, unnecessarily duplicative.

What the faculty member sees is that every time she signs an effort report, every time she verifies at timesheet, every time she fills out her recent publications in the 14th different format for the 14th slightly different period of time with 14 slightly different databases of what is and isn't a publication, that is time that is taken away from her laboratory. It is time that is taken away from her students. And she only has so much time even if she sleeps less than she used to.

The faculty at the FDP must be actively engaged as new procedures and new processes are considered and as old ones are modified and streamlined. We must present the viewpoint of what the implications of procedures and policies are to the faculty, and we must work in partnership with the administrators and the agencies to help develop and revise the procedures of compliance, so that they in fact do the utmost to ensure the ethics and integrity of our research, of our teaching, of our service, but so that they do not detract from that by producing unnecessary or redundant burdens that in fact do not serve that purpose.

We need to be, as faculty members, full partners in the Federal Demonstration Partnership, and we need to make our voices heard in a constructive and coordinated way. If I am elected to this position, that will be the role that I will attempt to play. And I thank you for the opportunity to be considered for that position.

NANCY WRAY: Good morning. First of all, I'm very honored to be asked to continue on in this position. I take that as a vote of confidence in the way that the FDP is moving. And I think there are a lot of things that we've gotten started that I am very anxious to see move along. The Faculty Burden Survey that we've been working on for so many years, the faculty, it's completed. We're going to hear about it. I think there are a lot of nuggets that I could say that will come out of that discussion.

I think there are other activities as we move to the phase five that we need to think about and address in trying to reach our overall mission of reducing administrative burden, getting our faculties back into their research areas, whether it's a lab or an office or whatever the research environment is for that particular faculty member, and try to reduce this amount of burden that we have seen grow over the years.

I think it's measurable. I think we can make some inroads in that to try to bring those percentages down. And I look forward to helping work on those projects. And again, taking a look at a lot of our administrative processes, where are the redundancies, where can we as partners with our federal folks come up with some solutions that can reduce the burdens both on the institutions and on our federal partners.

But I think we're well on the way. Some accomplishments that we do have is we're about to finish the relationship agreement with GUIRR that really outlines something that we've taken for granted in some cases, the relationship between our commitment, the commitment that GUIRR has to the FDP and what that relationship's about. We are, I would say within the next two or three weeks, that will be really ready for signature between the Academies and the FDP.

And I'm very pleased to have that document in place. I think it'll be a living document, and we can move forward as the organization changes and evolves, but at least it's a beginning and we all understand our roles. So I'm not going to make a long speech. You know who I am, and I look forward to your participation in the FDP.

I think that's the other thing, and I've heard this from folks, is that we need to have more people involved, not the same individuals all the time. Well, that's also your responsibility to volunteer and step up. This is a volunteer organization, and I know that we're all heavily burdened in our institutions and our agencies, but it's crucial that we do have many voices at the tables and that the organization is not directed by one or two but by the whole group. So I look forward to working with you over the next two years, and I thank you very much for your support.

DONNA HELM: So okay, balloting is going to start. It'll be available next week so that you, so that the candidates are fresh in your mind. Administrative reps, we want you to vote for Nancy as a vote of confidence and support for her continuing leadership. It's sort of like voting in the November elections in D.C. Faculty reps, you have a challenge. You have two very strong candidates to choose from. It'll be an interesting race.

So be clear, faculty vote for faculty, admin vote for admin. You'll get reminders from David Wright as the time goes on. We'd really like to see 100 percent this time. Voting closes on November the 1st, and you'll have the announcement by the 17th. Okay. So everybody vote, please. Oh, and we don't anticipate any reports of failures since you'll all be using your PCs, not the electronic voting machines.

NANCY WRAY: Thank you. We're going to go back to the recognition awards. As I mentioned, this is a volunteer organization, and we do need to recognize those folks that have really stepped up to the plate time and time again and provided us with support over the years and have volunteered perhaps from their organizations or institutions to host different things. And so I really do want to recognize those folks.

I'm a little concerned that a couple have not made it here yet, so I'm sort of watching the audience. But I do want to start, and one of the special recognitions we want to make to someone who has retired but has graciously come back, Beth Phillips, if you would come up, please. I want to present Beth with a plaque. Beth has really been part of the FDP in various positions, I think from HHS to OMB, working with us on Grants.gov, certainly with 106-107.

And let me tell you that a lot of the conversations and the way that things could move forward have been with Beth working behind the scenes, not only the, and the presentations that she's made to us. So Beth is off to new adventures, and we just wanted to show that we really appreciated all of her time that she spent with us.

BETH PHILLIPS: I was very surprised, very honored when I got the e-mail from David Wright and Nancy, and so I deeply appreciate the award. It's nice to be recognized for what I thought was hard work. And actually our Pioneer efforts, I think starting possibly with Geoff Grant, George Stone, Brad Stanford, certainly Paul Markovitz and myself, the federal commons, you know, I was thinking about it on the train and deciding whether to call it a dream or a fantasy, possibly a fantasy. But truly, people in the federal government, all the way down the line, are trying to streamline the process. I know it might not look that way to you sometimes.

But we are trying to streamline, whether it's standard terms and conditions or putting all of the OMB guidance in one location in the CFR, Code of Federal Regulations, or offering up a find and apply electronic option and so forth. And so everyone in the federal government really, or I think just about everyone, is very sincere in trying to make your life easier. We want you, of course, to focus on research, the things that are so important, and the grant-making is just that mechanism for getting the research funds out there. Thank you so very much.

NANCY WRAY: Okay. We have another individual who is going to be retiring, or not talking about retiring, talk about going on to the next adventure. And certainly he has been part of the FDP in many capacities. He took a brief sabbatical to the West Coast for a short period of time, but saw the wisdom and came back to the East Coast and this lovely city. Geoff, would you come up? We want to present you with this plaque in appreciation of all of your efforts for the FDP from the beginning to the end. We hope to see you again participating in some other capacity. But if not, good luck in your next adventure.

GEOFF GRANT: Thank you very much. I'll be with you throughout the meeting, but I just want to forecast that those of us that have been working on the strategic plan and the activities for this group have begun to frame it around research 2014, which would be the end of phase five. So I would just invite you as you spend time here over the next day and a half to begin to think about that vision and think about your activities and how you would like research and faculty time and research administrators and federal agencies to be working together by the year 2014. Thank you very much.

NANCY WRAY: Don Denson. Don, are you here? Many of you know that Don was really responsible for hosting the directory, the FDP directory that we've had for so many years. And this was really on his time, his institution's time and dollars that he supported the FDP. And we want to really thank you for all of that work. And again, it's part of the volunteerism, and thank you for your support.

DON DENSON: Thank you. I think that David will take this to the next level. As Nancy said, this was pretty much all done on my own time, and so things that could have been done a little better we just didn't have time to do. But at least we don't have clerks at the NAS typing name badges and filling out registration forms on paper anymore. And with that in mind, let me ask your support for getting rid of the book. This is a paperless society, and it's always bothered me that we kill so many trees for a paperless society. Thanks.

NANCY WRAY: And Tammy Custer. She hasn't gotten here yet. Okay. Well, we do have a plaque for Tammy. Tammy has supported the website for a number of years from Cornell, and it was, that's a lot of time and effort that she dedicated to that project. And so we do have a plaque for her, and if she doesn't make it here yet, the folks from Cornell, please take it back to her with our appreciation.

The other person that has moved on and is not here today but we want to recognize is Beth Israel. Beth started with the FDP from the very beginning, had been co-chairing the Membership Committee for a number of years, through a number of phases. And we really wanted to appreciate all of her efforts. She has moved on to a new position within Columbia and therefore will not be attending the FDP meetings, but we will send her her plaque in recognition of all of her time and efforts. Thank you, Beth.

Okay. I think that now moves us into the next section, and that's going to be the federal agency updates. And I'm asking Joe Ellis to come up and to ask his fellow colleagues to provide us with an update.

JOE ELLIS: I think we've only heard directly from a couple federal agencies who are ready to do an update, so we're going to have to poll the agencies we haven't heard from and make sure they don't have something to say. If you didn't send in slides in advance, please come up and make a few comments so that people can be updated on your activities. From Air Force Office of Scientific Research, is the representative here? Any updates? Just one.

KATHY WETHERELL: Good morning. I'm Kathy Wetherell from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. Just two things we're doing right now. To start with, to remind everybody, the continuing resolution, we will be operating under continuing resolution. So our grant options probably will be a little delayed, but as soon as the money, we get a portion of our budget to start, as soon as that comes through, we will be exercising those.

The other change we're making, again, we're changing our reporting requirements, and we're attempting to make them simpler. I don't know how it's going to work, but that's what we're trying to do. For the annual technical report, we're changing it to a 300-word update.

Basically we had an inspection and we're not fulfilling our requirements to send everything on to DTIC, and this is what they need, a summary of what the research has been doing for the last year. So we're going to be changing that. We'll have the requirements and have the details on our website, and we will do it in all new awards and eventually go back and correct it for the old previous awards. So that's it. Any other, any questions? Thank you.

JOE ELLIS: The Army Research Office. Going once. Okay. Department of Agriculture. Is Jason here? No updates. Okay. Thank you. Department of Energy. Okay. Anyone here from the Department of Energy? Okay. Environmental Protection Agency. Okay. It's going quickly.

NASA. Anyone here from NASA? Okay. The Office of Naval Research, I think I've already talked to Lambert. There's no update, Lambert, right, from ONR. And then U.S. Army Medical Research and Material Command, any representatives or updates? Okay. I guess that moves to the presentations we have available. Joanna, you want to go first? Okay.

JOANNA ROM: I'm going to make this quick. I have at least one of my experts in the room. I see Craig down front, so if we get to strategic plan and have questions, Craig's our person. Are Rick or Mike here from finance? Okay. So whatever I say, I get away with. Okay. This is real brief, but just a few updates.

New staff, Tony Chan from UCLA is about to join us as our assistant director for mathematical and physical sciences. We're very excited to have him coming. I've just been doing a detail in that office, helping out during the transition, and it's one of our most exciting directorates. We do everything from the largest distance you can see in a telescope to the tiniest subatomic particle. Wanda Ward, who many of you know as the executive officer in social behavior and economic sciences, is now our acting assistant director in education human resources while we're waiting for assignment of a new assistant director.

Also Dan Arvizu, who is the head of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, which is run by . . . for the Energy Department, is a member of the National Science Board and has been recently assigned to be the chairman of the Audit and Oversight Committee. And since that oversees the CFO function and the, well, CFO function reports the, you know, certain financial information in that committee. They also officially supervise the Inspector General function. And so we have a lot of interaction with that committee, and that's a change from Mark Wrighton who was the, is the chancellor of Washington University, had been the chairman and now Dan Arvizu is the chairman.

New spaces, if you come to visit us and you're looking for our finance or our budget people, they've moved over to Stafford II. They are closer to the main offices of the Inspector General. They are also further away than they would like from Starbucks. So if you come visit them, I don't know if this is soliciting help for federal agencies, but bring them a cup of coffee. You know, they're hurting.

CR, as my colleague said, it looks real likely that there's going to be a CR, and we're putting our plans in place for how we're going to be functioning under that. We have news that makes us somewhat optimistic in terms of what our 2007 budget might look like in terms of what we've been hearing from the House and the Senate, but it ain't over until the fat lady votes or sings or whatever. So stay tuned on that.

I wanted to mention just three things briefly that we're working on that you may have heard of and may have been, you know, wanting to follow. I think these actual slides will go up on the website, so I'm not going to read them to you, just sort of mention these in passing so you're aware of them and you can look them up later. But NSF has been very involved in the grants management line of business. We're one of the three consortia leads.

This round we are, we've already undertaken a pilot with USDA that will probably provide the capacity for proposal status checking. That would have a single portal set up. So I think we're still working on that. But this is just one of many things where

agencies will start pairing together to give sort of more consolidated portals. So in the long run, this will make things easier for all of us and should make things less expensive on our end and easier for you to interact with all of us on your end.

So that's the long-term vision, and it's kind of piece by piece. We're doing it kind of slowly, experimentally, you know, a little bit different model maybe than some of the testing that has been with Grants.gov, so it may be a little slower. But we really appreciate your efforts to work with us and to be involved in various test beds as they emerge from this activity.

We're now going on to the next steps where we're going to be having another round of consortia selection, and that information isn't going to be announced until the 2008 budget in February. So we do hope to have an update to you in January about where we are with the consortia testing, with the ones that we're working on. And I'm hoping I'll have Mary Santonastasso here or somebody working on the activity to come to the January meeting and report more detail. This is just more timeline information. As I said, there'll be probably more consortia announced in February, more steps.

One thing we've been working on particular, and I think that a number of you have been involved, certainly Hopkins, Cornell, MIT, and I think some other FDP schools have been in the test bed, is something that it ties into the grants management line of business in the sense that NSF has the potential for being cross-servicing. But this is really under, is Beth still there? I can't see. 106-107, streamlining the federal financial, under PL 106-107, streamlining the federal financial reports.

And we've been doing an online test of that. I think that the results have been successful. I think we tried to be responsive to the, I don't have a pointer, but the key features that you folks wanted in the testing of it. We're going to be going into another round of tests, and then it'll eventually be the only, we'll sort of phase out the fast-lane-y version of it and there will be only the combined FFR available in the fall. And I believe HHS is the other agency that is also doing an FFR test.

Then the third thing I wanted to mention was the NSF strategic plan, and this is a required update we do every five years, three years. Three years. And it's been a very inclusive process. I think FDP has gotten a number of notifications, you know, when we were asking for comments on the old strategic plan, when we were looking at versions of the draft strategic plan that we were considering. It went out for public comment over the summer. It was vetted within the agency, with the National Science Board.

At this point, it is in the Office of Management and Budget for their final blessing and review. And it will be, our expectation is, publicly available in early October, and we'll send that notification through FDP. It also will be the, as you can see, it will also be the underpinnings of the presidential budget request in 2008 that comes out in February. It is also grounded in the National Science Board's 2020 vision, which came out about, almost a year ago now.

One of the things, there's a whole bunch of details of how this stuff all ties together, but I think the important thing to understand is that it's very much aligned with the vision of the American Competitiveness Initiative. And so it ties in very, very nicely. I think almost, I mean, it certainly was influenced, but I think there's a convergence in the kind of thinking that we've been putting into it.

But I think our key themes of discovery, research infrastructure, and learning will be kind of critical ways in which we're doing our mindset of how we do our work at the

National Science Foundation, how we do our program planning. I think you'll see a lot more mention of American Competitiveness Initiative in the various solicitations over the next few years. And then we have detailed break-outs here that, we'll put this up on the Web page. And I think when the actual plan comes out in October, we can have more discussion. So any questions?

Joe Ellis: This is the NIH update. This is always a preview of the update we end up doing for NCURA and SRA's national meetings a little bit later in October. And I've included quite a few slides in here, not really to go over in great detail today, but so that they're available for reference. And my boss, Dr. Ruiz-Bravo just showed up, so I'm going to have to watch what I say, so if I'm a little quieter than usual, you understand.

I'd like to announce a new member to OPERA's staff in our policy division. Carol Wigglesworth has just joined us. Is Carol here now? Way in the back in the dark. She was warned that I tend to pick people out that are spotlighted, so . . . looks like she got herself in a nice, dark position. Carol worked in our office of Laboratory Animal Welfare and actually was the acting director for several years. And she's decided to take a change in course and to work in our Grants Policy Office, so we're extremely happy to have her on board. I hope you get a chance to talk to her a little bit today.

You all heard of Beth Phillips's retirement, and in an acting capacity, Tyson Whitney from the U.S. Department of Agriculture has moved over to take over her responsibilities. And we'll all get to know him a little bit better as well. Before I go into the meat of our update, Megan Columbus kind of schooled me to talk a little bit about Grants.gov.

I think one of the most popular articles in the *Washington Post* over the past year, I can tell you all enjoyed it very much, came out last week. They announced the awarding from Grants.gov of their new system integration services contract to a firm called Anteon Corporation, and they're going to be succeeding Northrop Grumman, and the transfer, I think, is supposed to take place at the end of October. And it's going to bring a number of changes that have really riveted a lot of people's attention.

Primarily they're going to be moving from the PureEdge forms-based package to Adobe forms, which will provide an advantage. It's going to satisfy a requirement to support all grant application platforms in the future. They're going to be physically moving their servers from one location to another, which is quite a challenge . . . of course, we expect to be under a continuing resolution. And the current budget we're working from is the president's budget request, which is flat for 2007 with no increase at all.

Even with that, there's a slight increase in the number of competing awards we hope to issue next year, competing research project grants. This is probably due to the natural recycling of grants and also due to the fact that we did cut our commitments for non-competing applications last year and probably gave ourselves a little bit of a ceiling with that. There's a link for more information from our budget office, and they really added quite a bit of useful background information on the budget along with the process we use in developing a budget.

We're also bringing to your attention a new data source at NIH that's been posted, the ability to graphically go to a map and click on that and find out the awards data for NIH. I think a lot of places are going to this format, and we just wanted to make

you aware that it's available. This is a new . . . a new program that has really sprung to life at NIH since we last met in May, and this is the genome-wide association studies. We're going to develop a consolidated database for investigators who are qualified to use this data, at the same time protecting the privacy of individuals who participate and provide the genomic data to this database.

We are requesting input from the community on the complications of this to better advise our policy development and initiatives from this. We're specifically asking for comments on data sharing policies and principles, intellectual property issues, and most importantly, protecting the participants in research from inappropriate disclosure of information. The RFI for those links are provided below, and the comment period for that closes at the end of October, so there's plenty of time to give you input. And at the bottom of the page, there's a link to the larger GWAS informational website.

This doesn't affect FDP, and you'll see that we're moving away from allowing foreign applicants from submitting their applications in the modular format, and they're being asked to provide detailed budgets as of October the 1st. And despite rumors, it's not a fact that, because we don't have any foreign members at the FDP, we felt free to make this change. But we do want to note that at the bottom, if you're submitting a competing modular application, this does not mean we expect to have a detailed budget for that foreign applicant included in the application.

So there's no additional burden to you. We're actually doing this because we found with many foreign institutions, they need additional assistance for compliance, and it's helpful for us to have more detailed information about the budget to facilitate that process. So this is really a way to try to help them and service their needs more effectively.

We published a policy after . . . it's a consultation process that includes . . . meetings and an RFI on a new NRSA policy to support tuition and fees on NRSA training and fellowship grants. Effective the next fiscal year as well as for grants that were competitively awarded in FY06, we have a new formula that moves away from the \$3,000 and 60 percent on costs above \$3,000 for tuition and fees to a level that limits the cost basically to 60 percent of tuition and fees.

We left the \$3,000 at 100 percent, and then caps that at \$16,000 per individual. Because of the complexity of this, we have developed tables that are included in the slide set that explain the current policy and the new policy and provides information on the shifts on things like institutional allowance, because we have shifted health insurance premiums from tuition and fees to health insurance and training-related fees.

The policy itself is labeled as a pilot because we provided an option that highlighted the institution's ability to re-budget funds that are awarded. And we're going to take the result of the policy to further develop our policy and probably make this more final in the future. Okay. This is the table for the individual fellowships.

We're also bringing your attention a streamlined review process for individual fellowship applications, F32's. This was published in June. Beginning with applications, were submitted in August. Study sections are going to use NIH streamlined review procedures, which will allow reviewers to spend more time discussing competitive applications.

So approximately 40 percent of the NRSA applications for F32's will be deemed non-competitive by the committee and will not be scored. So they won't receive a full

discussion in the study section of the meeting. It's not a, we lost an E in that. And will not resume, we will not have a resume summary discussion paragraph in their summary statements.

These are just updates on the current updates on the multiple-PI initiative. We really don't have anything new to announce here. We're in the middle of a phase of working through our pilots and are getting quite a bit of information from those, as well as working with linked applications from separate institutions to facilitate multiple PI.

The policy for late applications has just been reissued. It hasn't really been changed significantly. It still requires that you can't get approval prior to submitting your application. You have to submit a cover letter to CSR with a really good excuse for the late application. And we won't guarantee that we will accept it until we receive that. The primary basis for accepting a late application, of course, is . . . on the NIH review committee. Well, it's for good reason. It's a tough job. We have updated this for both the paper and the electronic world, and the definition of on time, of course, has changed with electronic submission, so the application captures that as well.

Moving on into our compliance activities, I know many of you have heard about or been blessed with a visit under our targeted site visits for financial conflict of interest. We are doing this to specifically review agency or institution's implementation of the Financial Conflict of Interest regulations, 45 part, 50 subpart F. And to date, I think we've visited something like 18 institutions. We're planning on visiting something like maybe eight or so more institutions before we're done by the end of the calendar year.

And these have been done basically just exactly how the institutions are implementing the policy to make sure that we share a common understanding of what the regulation requires and how the institutions are implementing that. And we're following up on issues of noncompliance that we might identify in these reviews. This slide gives an overview of the reporting requirements that I think you're all well familiar with.

Some of the things that we have observed as issues at some of the institutions we visited are the definition of an investigator. And in the regulation, it defines investigator as the PI and any other person who's responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research funded by PHS. So the term investigator is not just limited to the principal investigator on the application, but could be anyone who has that, one of those roles in the application. Now this is not something that's defined by NIH that a certain person would automatically have that role or automatically wouldn't have that role. It's up to the institution to make those judgments.

We are also noting, as you've heard probably several times already, that the National Science and Technology Council has taken over the initiative from the HHS OIG on the compliance guidance, and that's a really promising development to develop something that's going to be useful for the community and eliminate the risk factors, which were the primary concern that I heard in the initial reaction to that guidance.

Now finally, we really do like to leave you on a high note, a very positive bit of news, so we thought we'd give you the, so selected highlights from the Office of Inspector General's workplace work plan for the coming year. They're planning on focusing on university administrator and clerical salaries. That's a topic we all hold near and dear.

Subrecipient costs and monitoring and cost transfers. There's a link to their overall work plan, and it just shows that we have to continually work together to better define what are appropriate administrative responsibilities so that you can apply what that is in a reasonable way while keeping a reasonable burden. Are there any questions or comments? Okay. That's very good. The next presentation we have is from OMB. Carrie is it Hug or Hugue? Carrie Hug is going to give us an update on 106-107.

CARRIE HUG: Good morning. I am Carrie Hug from the Office of Federal Financial Management of OMB. And I want to congratulate you, Beth. Beth just left us right before I came on board, and you are very, very much missed, Beth. Nancy asked me via Joe and David to give you a current update on where we are on the Federal Financial Assistance Management Act of 1999. Of course, it's easier to say PL 106-107.

As you know, the vision is one place for all grants administration policies, one catalog with all assistance programs listed, one announcement format of assistance opportunities. So in other words, one standard format, announcement synopsis available electronically, etc. Our goals are to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and performance, simplify application and reporting, improve delivery and service.

The grant streamlining initiative, starting with PL 106-107, to provide coordination and oversight of inner agency initiatives through the Grants Policy Committee, coordinate the agency's annual report to Congress, implement work group products. The grants management line of business is to provide direct coordination of itself, serve as one of the nine government lines of business, envision a common end-to-end solution to support grantor and grantees, and applies a consortia-based approach to shared business interests.

Grants.gov or eGovernment initiative is to improve access to services via the Internet and to provide single, unified storefront for finding and applying for grants. Our ongoing activities include the fiscal year 2006 annual report to Congress, which is due in November, terms and conditions, award notice, national policy requirements, unified performance, real property and personal property reports, which are near completion, government-wide grants management career development plans, revision of SF424A, which you know as the budget program, and the surveys that are out to constituents, which we are waiting for feedback.

Future activities include implementation of government-wide forms, fiscal year 2007 annual report to Congress, increased communication and outreach with grantee community, continued improved communication and collaboration with Grants.gov and GMLOB. Our future products, one standard form for the following reports, invention summary report, federal financial report, real property report, personal property report, performance and progress report, research progress report.

Also a, other future products include the CCR registration policy, standard award terms and conditions, standard awards notices, proposal for handling certifications and assurances, standards for grant specialists and grant officers training and certification, agency relocation of suspension and debarment regulations.

And in closing, I know you didn't ask this, Nancy, but I wanted to touch a little bit on the Coburn bill, which we all know has been the highlight of several of our lives

lately, or finally referred to as 2590 or the grants database, if you will. OMB does support this bill and will work with the agencies to get the process started. The bill is on the way to the President, and OMB is approaching the agencies to design and collect grant information from sub-grantees and subcontractors, all in the effort to help reduce waste and ineffective spending. And I do want to thank you for allowing me to speak this morning.

NANCY WRAY: Thank you. Are there questions?

CARRIE HUG: You know, the lights are in my eyes, so I can't see.

Dick Seligman: That's just fine. I'll tell you that I'm from an institute of technology, but you'll have to guess which one. We've been hearing for some time now that the FDP, the Federal Demonstration Partnership, terms and conditions are going to be succeeded by a government-wide set of research terms and conditions that will be used by federal agencies, either those that are part of the FDP or ultimately all federal grant-making agencies that will award research grants to colleges and universities.

At our last meeting, we were assured that come Labor Day, these new terms and conditions, that is, Labor Day of 2006, that these terms and conditions would be published in their final form in the Federal Register and would be ready for implementation. I believe Labor Day has come and gone, and I'd like to ask you to tell us where things stand with regard to the terms and conditions.

CARRIE HUG: I have a confession. I'd like to ask Beth to come up and help me. I just joined OMB at the, as Beth left, so if you could . . .

BETH: . . .

GEOFF GRANT: I think that it's likely to be published within the next 30 to 60 days . . . good news is that discussion . . .

BETH: . . .

Dick Seligman: Sort of. As the co-chair of the Terms and Conditions Committee, I'm deeply concerned that you and Geoff Grant are both on your way out the door, as it were, and we're still waiting. And the Terms and Conditions Committee has been placed in a state of disarray for the last several years waiting for this to happen. And so anything that you can do, Geoff, in fact, I think you should return your plaque until this . . .

CARRIE HUG: Thank you, Beth. I will follow up on that and find out where we are to make a more solid deadline.

PARTICIPANT: Excuse me, I have a question. Why is DOD . . .

PARTICIPANT: . . . yes, it's a gathering of the uninformed . . .

NANCY WRAY: Carrie, I'd also just like to make the comment that the House, or the bill that was just passed where they're going to pilot the subrecipients, I would encourage OMB to look at bringing that to this organization to help you develop that and to pilot that project.

CARRIE HUG: I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

JOE ELLIS: Now we have Merrilea who's going to talk about GUIRR.

MERRILEA MAYO: This update is a new feature that Nancy and the Executive Committee decided might be beneficial for the FDP membership. As many of you may not realize, the National Academies is not a federal agency. We are a nonprofit organization. But we are an organization that gave birth to the FDP many years ago, and GUIRR is a unit in the National Academies that still provides the home for FDP activities.

And so we thought it might be interesting for the FDP membership to hear what was going on in GUIRR, much of which is complementary at a policy level to that which happens in FDP on an implementation level. All of us in GUIRR get to know what happens in FDP because Nancy or whoever the current chair is of FDP provides an update to the GUIRR membership at every meeting. But we have never done the reverse for FDP, so this is a first.

There are currently three activities going on within GUIRR which you may find interesting. The first revolves around a report that will be issued this Friday. It's called the Here or There Report, and it describes in quantitative terms as the result of a survey, and we all like surveys now in FDP, a survey of decision-makers at 200 companies in the U.S. and Europe, the reasons why they choose to site their R&D facilities in one country versus another.

And the reason, I think this will be interesting to the FDP membership, is that many of the institutional representatives also serve in organizations like COGR. And one of the very interesting policy implications of this document is that relationships between companies and universities are as important as costs in driving companies to do research overseas.

There are actually three important factors in causing companies to site their R&D in overseas locations and emerging countries. The first is the growth potential of the market in that country, so that's the most important reason to go overseas. The second reason, there are two factors tied. One is intellectual property protection, which is a negative. It's a detractor from moving overseas.

Tied with that as an attractor is the quality of the R&D personnel that are available overseas to do the R&D work. And then the third factor is cost tied with quality of university R&D relationships, the ability to sponsor research at universities and have good collaborations. So those of you who are beating the Hill to argue for increased funding for universities may find that an interesting policy argument.

The discovery that university R&D relationships are very important to the competitiveness of the nation was also instrumental in our decision to launch a spin-off organization called the University Industry Demonstration Partnership. The name is no

accident. It is a parallel organization to the FDP. Whereas the FDP concerns itself with university/government research relationships, this new organization will deal with university/industry research relationships.

And its first demonstration will be something called turbo negotiator, which is a way to quickly and hopefully painlessly navigate through the complex maze of university/industry-sponsored research agreements in a way that avoids many of the stalling points associated with intellectual property negotiations. So that will be the first demonstration of that new organization. It will have its first meeting on December 13th, 2006, so it's very new.

The third item of interest I think to the FDP membership will be, is a partnership activity that we have with the FDP in the emerging research institution area. GUIRR has proposed to the National Academies' presidents and it has received permission to conduct a workshop and policy report on ways in which small institutions, those with less than \$15 million of sponsored research, could either band together or partner with larger institutions to share administrative and structural resources.

What often happens in small institutions, that they have small sponsored research offices, small institutional capacity to do all this paperwork that we've been hearing about, and as a result, that burden falls even more intensively on the faculty, making it extremely difficult for faculty in smaller institutions to be able to conduct research because they have more than their fair share of other administrative burdens.

So we're looking at very practical partnerships, which should achieve economies of scale, even providing benefits to the large institution that undertakes a partnership with the small ones, so that overall the burden is lifted off of faculty, particularly those at the emerging institution. So we will be doing a policy piece of this within GUIRR. And then hopefully the emerging research institution, I don't know what it's called now, sort of an affiliation group, within the FDP will take on the demonstration activities that are described in the report and workshop as being the most promising. Thank you.

NANCY WRAY: Are there any questions for Merrilea? Okay. That concludes our federal updates. I think we need to do some work in that area, and it'll be an objective to have additional agencies provide us with update at our next meeting. We're a little ahead of schedule. Geoff did bring up the strategic planning group.

Tomorrow we're going to have a fuller report on the activities of the strategic planning group. But I was glad that he had mentioned the overarching theme that we are looking kind of beyond and where we want to be at the end of the next phase. And so we'll have some more information. We're still working diligently on this process. So I think we're a little ahead. Let's go ahead and take a break and then move into our concurrent sessions. Thank you.

Tuesday, September 19, 2006

NANCY WRAY: I want to remind people that we need two pieces of data from your various committees. What we need are the minutes from your committee that we can post on the website. As you recall, on the website under your committee or taskforce

assignment, there's a place for minutes. Those minutes should be sent to David Wright in order for him to put those in.

In addition, we need highlights. We need like three or four bullet points from your discussions from this meeting. As you recall, there was enthusiasm for not having individual report-outs because we lost so many of our members, so that what we're trying to do is for the facilitators or co-chairs to send to David three or four highlights or points that we can put in a summary of the meeting and get that out the week following the meeting. We haven't been consistently getting that information, so I'm going to really ask you all and hold your feet to the fire to provide that information.

And before we go into the NIH/FDP streamlining initiative, I would like to do one thing, which is Tammy Custer is here now. And due to plane difficulties, she couldn't get here yesterday. I do want to present her with her plaque of appreciation for all the work she has done in the past with the website. Tammy. Okay. Let's begin with the results of the NIH streamlining study.

PARTICIPANT: Well, this is a follow-up to the meeting that you had in Seattle. And just to restate, the problem is that to the research community, NIH is one funding agency, and we would like to think that the guidelines and policies apply across all of the ICs. In practice, there are individual IC guidelines and individual IC practices. So the goal of this project was to identify opportunities for harmonization of policies, practices, and procedures across all of the institutes.

The potential benefits of uniform and consistent policies are increased efficiency of the process of application, a decrease in the errors in award management, and fewer errors and misunderstandings while obviously reducing the need for rework, both by our staff at the university and by NIH staff.

The background that many of you recall is that in January of 2006, Nancy met with the NIH Extramural Management Committee and described the problem. She suggested the FDP as a venue for change. NIH agreed to the project, and a committee was appointed. In April of 2006, the FDP members were surveyed for examples. Twenty-four schools responded. At the May FDP meeting, greater than 80 members attended an open session and shared additional concerns.

Additional examples continue to be submitted. Some of them are, we . . . but there they are. The responses were sorted and prioritized, and the sorting was into a number of categories. First what my colleague at Yale, Rebecca Ballantine(?), called rogue practices, and we loved the name so we're using it, where one individual or institute creating requirements in conflict with published NIH policies or guidelines.

Then there are grants management issues, which are technical issues which the NIH Grant Management Advisory Committee could change or clarify without a major policy change. And third, our practices which will require more extensive discussion and policy change.

We then prioritized these into high, medium, and lower priority concerns. So among the high-priority concerns were honoring renegotiated F&A rates on competitive renewals, defining effort and providing salary on career development awards. There was a lively discussion in May about that issue.

Permission to submit issues, and these extend not only to the permission to submit an eRA, one that is greater than \$500,000, but the requirements for letters of

intent on program projects, on their issues around when do you submit the request, to whom do you submit the request, what's required in that submission. We've heard some tales of enormous amount of information, almost a mini site visit before they're even permitted to submit. And then when will the PI receive an answer as to whether or not they are, they may actually submit. Again, people are concerned about missing the deadline.

Continuing with high-priority concerns, expanded authorities on training grants have been raised. Some ICs do. Some don't. Lack of a policy on submission of other material to study section. There is no policy and there is enormous variability. Responsibility of the prime grantee IRB for subrecipient protocols. This has become a very contentious issue, and we think it can be clarified easily by training, but it is a problem.

Mid-level concerns are caps and restrictions on direct cost increases for competitive continuation grants. All ICs do not permit support of pre-doctoral, post-doctoral, and short-term research training in spite of the fact that all are permitted under the NRSA. That will be addressed. NIH EMS is the only institute that we know of, so that's why they're named, that limits the dollars awarded to one PI without an official announcement of the policy. And that limit is \$750,000, which means one program project, or it may look like three modulars, but it could be one program project.

Not all ICs accept training grants on all three official receipt dates. There is a need for definition of the requirements for second and third no-cost extensions. I know we have a group within FDP that's looking at that as well. There are some ICs that do not permit second-tier subaward, and then the use of the commons for no-cost extensions.

Of lower priority is when is an application late. NIH has published a notice, and yet one institute in particular said, well, that's true, but sometimes we could be more lenient. Well, it's a lower priority because they're being more lenient, not more strict, but it would be worthwhile getting some clarity. Allowability of administrative . . . on program projects.

Certification of a principal investigator's immigration status prior to awarding a K-series grant, documentation of IRB education for primary and subgrantees. Automatic termination of no-cost extensions when a renewal award is issued. Requirements for detailed multi-year revised budgets when award is to be issued with a budget decrease.

So plans for going forward, this is a slide you saw in Seattle. And what I've done is those things that are color coded in yellow are things that we have done. We've examined the examples with our colleagues from NIH. We've determined perhaps not the root causes, but the causes of some of the variation. We have identified changes which can be made easily, those that don't require legislative or regulatory changes.

We are now in the second process of seeking consensus at NIH to make those changes. And during that process, we'll identify barriers. We continue the dialogue. I am going to be meeting with the NIH Extramural Management Committee tomorrow, and they will see the same list, and we have some suggestions about possibilities and we'll seek their suggestions.

NANCY WRAY: Are there any questions?

PARTICIPANT: I just wanted to say, we could work forever on this, but there are things that are very disruptive for institutions. And with the coming of the 424 forms, the NIH institutes have had to sit down and to harmonize practices. And so I feel that the NIH is at a point where more of this kind of compromise will be possible, and so we're going to work for these.

I hope anyone that has examples or if you haven't had an opportunity to send something forward, you can send it to Suzanne or myself. And I would hope we might be able to make this a somewhat more continuous process of identifying these sorts of levels. They're not big global things, I understand, but sometimes these little things are incredibly irritating. They make it difficult for you to have a uniform policy. And a lot of them ought to be fixable. That's where we are.

NANCY WRAY: I want to thank you for the effort. I think it's really, as you said, it may not be global, but these are the things that can cause us a lot of problems in the day-to-day, and so I think this is a great step forward. Thank you. Next, Megan Columbus is here to update us on the NIH eSubmission.

MEGAN COLUMBUS: I know many of you, but for those who don't know me, I'm Megan Columbus. I'm responsible for managing NIH's transition to electronic submission of grant applications to Grants.gov. It's been an interesting year for me. Letting you know today where we are, how far we've come, and what our plans are going forward, of which I am sure there is quite a lot of interest in based on the previous conversation and in the *Washington Post* this week.

We've come a long way, and we really have. We received over 12,000 applications electronically to date. We've posted over 350 opportunities that accept electronic submissions. Things that were very interesting and that we were watching very closely, our June 1st submission date for our small grants. Those are our R03, R21's, which in our world are, you know, many R01's, went extremely smoothly, which bodes well for R01 transition.

We got over 2,700 applications. And importantly in my mind, is in December, I remember I came to FDP in January and I said there's a whole lot of corrections going on with our small business applications, and we're working very hard to increase our communications so that we can get that number down. Well, it seems as though the Office of . . . Research had been doing a very good job of understanding the expectations and submitting applications that don't need that many corrections. And we appreciate that, and the numbers are testifying that you guys are very successful doing that.

The other thing that we are watching very closely are help desks and their ability to handle the call volume. It's very difficult to staff help desks for large spikes in call volume, and so we've been getting much better in that area as well, and we're continuing to make improvements.

So the big question I think here today is, you know, what's NIH's plans for R01's. And very honestly, we've made no decision to change the R01 date. What we are doing is watching very, very closely what's happening in the next few weeks with Grants.gov. We would not go forward with R01's if it means a large risk to getting those applications in the door.

If we can't get Grants.gov to guarantee for us that the system as we know it today will be stable and able to perform at least as well as we know it does today, we wouldn't want to go forth because we're not able to very efficiently backtrack. We wouldn't want you to have to prepare a 424 and then have to put in a 398. We want to make sure that support staff at Grants.gov isn't busy transitioning to Adobe and not having everybody there in place for R01's. So we're trying to get those kinds of things in place to make sure that we protected the R01 submission date.

Once we do that, we'll move forward. I expect to know for sure by the end of October. I truly think they'll be able to work it out with Grants.gov, that we can make sure that we have everything we need in place. But we have to be candid that in order to manage our risks, you have to know that these discussions are ongoing. And it's protected both for you all and for us, because we really want those applications in the door as smoothly as we can get.

So we're continuing to aggressively plan for the R01 transition in February. And of course, for everything that comes after the R01 transition, and we have some big fish to fry after those R01's. So one of the things that's happening, and it hasn't been mentioned earlier, which I think is just an oversight, is that February 5th is actually the new February 1st. We're spreading receipt dates to level the application load.

We're doing that to level system load so that you'll have greater system response time. We're doing that because in the current state of affairs, for our major submission dates, everything comes in. We get something like 4,500 applications on a single receipt date. It can go up to 8,000 applications for a single receipt date. They pile up waiting for us to process them. It's not an efficient use of resources on our end. I don't think it's an efficient use of your time to have artificial deadlines. Hopefully this will help your process as well.

We talked to Grants.gov and we consulted with them about when their major receipt dates were from other agencies, and they said stay off the 1st and 15th of the month, and so we did. And so what that'll do is it will reduce the volume from all the other agencies and hopefully that'll speed up Grants.gov's response time so that our applicants will have higher priority.

We're also reducing the volume by spreading apart by mechanisms receipt dates. So R01's will have a receipt date all their own, and I'll give you a preview of what the receipt dates are right now. And R03, R21's would have a receipt date two weeks later. That should help our processes a lot and hopefully it'll also help the volume and how you have to manage how many are coming through your offices at the same time.

So this is a quick preview. It's not all of our mechanisms, but this is what we're looking at. It was just approved by our governance committees in the last day and a half, so this is hot off the press. You should see a guide announcement coming out end of this week, beginning of next, once we finalize the language around that announcement. You will see that R01's are coming in on the 5th of February, and that would, you know, span across all of our receipt dates.

So that would mean that the resubmissions, continuations, etc. would be coming in also the 5th of March, so we tried to keep that parallelism. R03's will be coming, R21's will be coming in a couple weeks later. Those are our two higher-volume submissions. So complete details will come out in the guide notice.

Other preparations, we're doing a whole lot. We're tracking Grants.gov and IBM's completion of the PureEdge for Mac solution. That's an important piece for us for February in our minds. We're continuing to monitor and improve system performance. So for ERA systems, hopefully you all have noticed that they've been getting progressively faster in terms of their response time. We shortened our service standards, so whereas we were telling you the service standard for Grants.gov was two days, and then ERA processing could take up to two days, now we're generally processing within minutes.

Occasionally it might get up to an hour, so that service standard has been shortened too. If you've been told by Grants.gov that the agency, that the application is ready for agency retrieval and you don't hear anything from our agency in 24 hours, feel free to give us a call, find out. Just note that that does not, that doesn't affect your two-day viewing window. Those are two different things. Okay. This only has to do with how quickly you can expect us to manage your application.

And we're busily preparing for R01 still, so we have NIH institutes and centers who are revising hundreds of R01 funding opportunity announcements. We're revising it to include new language. They're developing parent announcements, that kind of thing. I think you'll also know that there was a request for information about appendix materials recently.

The results of the evaluation about the need for appendices may affect application size. And from my perspective, having to deal with electronic submissions, that'll probably be in a very good way. I do believe that we're going to be reducing the size of the appendices fairly substantially for many of our mechanisms. So that request for information just closed, and you'll start seeing in the R01 announcements when they start being posted in November some details for that.

And we're continuing to do outreach and training with NIH staff. We recognize that it's as hard at NIH to communicate what our program officers and our scientific review administrators should be communicating out, as I'm sure it is in your institutions, trying to communicate and educate your staff and faculty. But we're trying to keep a consistent message for you.

We're enhancing the depth and breadth of help desk staffing, so we're continuing to staff up the help desk. We're continuing to give them developmental opportunities so we retain staff that have higher levels of understanding and a greater ability to address some of the more complex issues. And as Jean, wherever she went to, alluded to in her session previously, we're working through a whole lot of those issues for mechanisms that are going to transition. It's, you know, there's forms development needed for K's and T's.

It's we're working on how NIH is going to receive letters of references for our Pioneer applications, and we'll be doing that pretty much through the Commons. We're looking toward short-term stop-gap measures for how we're going to approach collaborative mechanisms and longer term how we can really do that through Grants.gov, so that we can see that all these applications really belong together so they get delivered to NIH and get delivered to our scientific review administrators together.

We're looking at possible solutions for handling complex mechanisms and trying to nail down our requirements. You know, all of these agencies have some really complex stuff out there that needs to be sorted through, and we're continuing to try and

articulate those requirements to Grants.gov so that the new contractor, now that it's on board, can be thinking about how their system architecture can support the needs of these complex mechanisms.

And I just wanted to highlight that we're also working with some of the other NIH operating divisions, like CDC and FDA and others, so that they can also use ERA Commons to accept applications through Grants.gov. Some agencies, like CDC, already do use Grants.gov, but they don't use the Commons on the back end, and that will improve the efficiency of their operations considerably when they do that. So they're anxious to come on board, and I think you'll see them having announcements out very soon. In fact, I believe they have R03, R21 announcements coming out right now that require the step through the Commons as well.

We've been working really, really hard on outreach, and we continue to work really hard on outreach, so we've scheduled a December 5th training session. Again, it'll be a plenary Web cast as we had one in January. We wanted to schedule one closer to the R01 submission date so that you could take advantage of that. We can give you some of our lessons learned over the past year to make things easier.

And we're coupling that with, for the people who really want to come to Washington and really want to get walked through with some hands-on labs to go with that. If those become really popular, we'll try and schedule more of those. I'm not sure they're absolutely necessary, but some people find learning that way much easier.

We continue to do NIH regional seminars. We continue to send people to the scientific meetings. The Society for Neuroscience has workshops fairly frequently. I think there's ones three or four evenings during that meeting. Other scientific meetings, of course, too will be at SRA and . . . and all the administrative meetings.

Listserv, so NIH has an eSubmission Listserv, one targeted towards administrators and one targeted towards PIs. If you're doing a lot of work with NIH, I would highly encourage you to get on that listserv. Sherry Cummins, our communications coordinator out here in the audience, she does a really good job trying to get you information as early as possible and give you early heads-up so you don't get caught unaware.

And the website is still our primary modes of communication, and so if you don't see something that you're looking for, if you don't find answers, we want to know because we want this to be a primary vehicle. And you can subscribe to the listserv right on this homepage.

And we have continuing challenges. You know, there's a whole lot of challenges for all of us in all of this. One of them for us has been, and Jean, again, alluded to it, you know, form versioning is difficult, and all of that's wrapped up in any kind of downloadable form solution is going to have this problem, so that if you're working off of one of NIH's parent R21 announcements, for example, and institutions have been doing this, which makes a whole lot of sense.

You fill out some of the institutional information. Then you route it around your institution. But form versions change, and Grants.gov is also able to slide changes into form sets that aren't real, it doesn't go from one version to another, I guess, because they're not major enough. But it does change the form sets.

So the one thing I want to encourage you to do is, when developing a new proposal, have people go back to the original funding opportunity announcement or

each round, if you do it centrally and then distribute those application packages, go back to the original announcement and re-fill out a new form. Until we know for sure, until you can look at that form and know what version it is, I don't know the better advice to give for this.

And just one word of advice, please, please encourage people to take advantage of that two-day viewing window where you can see your assembled application in the Commons. You know, you wouldn't throw an application into a FedEx box without flipping through it first, but we really want people to understand that once that two-day viewing period is over, that application is off to the scientific review administrator and your reviewers will see that application.

So that even if you are able to work with a scientific review administrator after the fact to correct a page on your application or whatever it needs to be, a figure, that gets added on in addition to what is there. Okay? So they will see the original blunder, whatever it was, even if you are able to change it after the fact.

So as always, help us improve. We're in this together. We really want to hear from you. We really want to hear what your successes are, what's working well. We really want to know what's not working well, even if that not working well is at the front end, at Grants.gov, it helps me a whole lot to hear what that is because it allows me to put pressure from one end while you all are putting pressure from another end. So let us know. I do get all the feedback that comes to our central feedback box, and it's important to us to continue forward together. May I take questions? No. Oh, good. Oh, I was so close.

PARTICIPANT: I do have one question. And that is, if we're going to Adobe for forms, then why continue to put effort in developing a PureEdge solution for Mac? It seems like it's a waste of money and time. Couldn't they put that money and time into a faster development of the Adobe forms?

MEGAN COLUMBUS: Just different people doing it. If they, they're already, by the time they had awarded the contract, they had already gotten a couple beta versions, and so Grants.gov was already testing the beta versions. So right now they might as well finish. At least that's my perspective, because, and I don't know this for sure, so now I'm talking out of school because I'm talking about, you know, what my ultimate wish would be. So if we, we're working on PureEdge in February for R01's. Let's just say that everything works, we're working in PureEdge in February for R01's. They're implementing an Adobe solution started April 1st.

PARTICIPANT: Well, I thought the Adobe solutions was trying, they were trying to get that for a February deadline.

MEGAN COLUMBUS: No. So that's starting for April.

PARTICIPANT: April 1st.

MEGAN COLUMBUS: But I won't have the opportunity to see how well that solution works at the beginning of April, which is a timing when I would have to re-publish all of NIH's opportunities with the new form sets.

And so ideally for me, unless we knew that the Adobe solution was a quick and easy win and there was no hitches, we might want to explore having the R01's in PureEdge for February and for the next round until we found that it was stable. But I don't know if we're going to be able to do that. That's my preliminary thinking as I think through what some of the potential risks of the transition might be, just because it just is happening at a very awkward time for NIH's transition timeline.

PARTICIPANT: I just had a, I wouldn't publicize that February 5th too broadly . . . applications on time.

PARTICIPANT: . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: It keeps life extremely interesting for us as well.

PARTICIPANT: Is there a moratorium before, a period before . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: What we have is actually, NIH has been a little bit concerned about the change process at Grants.gov, so actually Jen Flach, who's actually sitting in the audience back here, she's been leading our technical development team at NIH. And even though she's doing that, it was important for us to get that change management process in place, so we actually have her on detail with Grants.gov two days a week to work on change management for them. And so she's working on a plan to try and help the, I don't know, Jen, do you know any . . .

JEN FLACH: It has been such . . . it keeps changing and things come out that the feds don't even know that it's being changed. So we would love . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: Yeah, we're working very hard because it's very difficult because we don't know what's in testing and production and things either. And it's very difficult, especially for, you know, poor Scarlet here who's supporting the help desk, and the help desk is trying to work and they're not sure what they're working with either. And so this is a high priority for us to get it under control.

JEN FLACH: And it's even more challenging because they'll give you a date, they'll give you your forms, and then they'll say just use them . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: They don't tell you what to change. Right. So we're working in, we're trying to work and help them develop a process that will stabilize some of that.

PARTICIPANT: Good luck. We're with you.

MEGAN COLUMBUS: Thank you. Can I ask a quick question about, what's your reaction to spreading receipt dates? Is this like, your gut reaction, is this better for you all? Universally? That was an easy win. Why thank you. Other questions?

PARTICIPANT: Thumbs up.

MEGAN COLUMBUS: Thumbs up. Good. Okay. Yeah.

PARTICIPANT: I'd like to ask a question about the . . . message on Grants.gov, how it doesn't relate to . . . on the NIH, where Grants.gov . . . so are you working to . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: No, we're not. And the problem is, is that they're interagency form sets, and so NIH has a set of business rules, but we can't build our business rules into those form sets. So that can only check what the standards are, and Jean can probably address this better, but it could only address what's standard for all the agencies. So NIH's business rule couldn't be built into that, and it would be nice if they could.

NANCY WRAY: One more question.

PARTICIPANT: . . . if you're going to spread the dates . . . is it going to be institute by institute or . . .

MEGAN COLUMBUS: No. Spreading the dates for submission is by mechanism. So R01's get their own receipt date. R03, R21's get their own receipt date. P's get moved, you know. It looks more like that.

NANCY WRAY: Megan, thank you very much. We appreciate your presentation. The next presentation then came out of a thought that we weren't clear how ready the community is to be doing the Grants.gov. And so COGR, Council on Governmental Relations, and FDP got together and developed a survey which you all received either through COGR or through the FDP, a series of questions to see where we were.

And Gunta and Steve Dowdy have pored through the data and are going to give us a summary of what they found. I want to thank David Wright for really getting a survey together and getting it out and pulling the information off. I think we have 88 pages of data, so it was, and thank you all for responding.

GUNTA LIDERS: We actually had 125 responses. Twenty-three of those were after the deadline. So what you're going to see today is a tabulation of 102 responses, 104, okay, that actually met the deadline, and these are going to be quick observations. While we did go through the material, obviously there will be other groups going through it in more detail, seeing maybe if there are projects or initiatives that FDP can take upon by looking at the data. So again, these are going to be our quick observations, and we're going to show you the numbers, and then we're also going to perhaps read one or two quotes from the institutions that did submit. They may or may not be funny.

STEVE DOWDY: First of all, just the first thing, you can see the breakdown, eight schools under \$15 million, \$30 million, \$100 million . . . responses and stuff, so I think that's pretty representative of the mix here at the FDP.

GUNTA LIDERS: Okay. Our first question was, do you believe that your institution has adequately addressed the training needs for faculty administrators. And the yes responses, most of us felt that we really had addressed the training needs. In reading the responses, it was really evident how much time, resources, institutions have put into training. I think that's absolutely true in the government agencies as well.

There were some schools that really said, hey, you know what, we don't have a lot of resources for training, so there would be redirection of resources or there might be insufficient resources to really do a good job, and some schools kind of reverted to the just-in-time method for training, so training the folks that are going to be submitting that next week or whatever, and that was sort of their methodology. One of the comments was, hey, you know what makes training really difficult are the frequent changes in the applications and the multiple application format. This is a real challenge for institutions.

STEVE DOWDY: Yeah. And we thought we'd maybe just read a couple samples. The responses were very, very similar from a lot of schools, even in the yes/no's. If it was a no, the no's tended to have the exact same issues. And if it was a yes, the comments were very much alike.

And so for that question people said, you know, this is a yes/no answer, training has been provided and continue to be provided, it's hard to keep up with all of the Grants.gov changes, confusion is being generated on a daily basis. Our attempt to address the updates and keep the research abreast with what is being developed in Grants.gov is a problem for us. We continue to have in-house distribution and training and stuff.

One of the other ones I think I had here, adequately is unknown at this time, we will continue training on our campus. It says, until the applications are 100 percent in Grants.gov, we must continue to support multiple training efforts since we have multiple training, or multiple submissions at this point. And I think they're getting at where, you know, a lot of the programs say you can submit paper or Grants.gov or through this other system. So right now we're having to train people on how to, continuing support multiple submission vehicles.

GUNTA LIDERS: Excellent.

STEVE DOWDY: And then the third question on do you find agency-specific Grants.gov instructions consistent and/or clear, there was 66 no's and 38 yes's. And I think, as Jean was saying and stuff, of the constant-changing instructions are problematic. Many times the funding opportunities may conflict with the application instructions. The help desk advice may conflict. Interpretation of form fields, we've seen several and there was many comments in the survey where agencies or specific program announcements are starting to re-purpose fields.

For those of you that saw the . . . solicitation on Tuesday, they specifically had a requirement that said in the applicant place, where you're supposed to put the applicant

identifier on that first page, put the agency contact point in that field. So we're starting to see these re-purposing of fields, where agencies go we don't like that piece of data, we'll make them give us a different piece of data in that same field.

And then we had applications instructions vary in clarity and quality. There was comments that, you know, yeah, there is great, there's a 50-page, you know, instruction guide from NSF, but our PIs don't have time to read that because it's so large, so there was comments all over the board about the length and the quality of the instructions.

GUNTA LIDERS: And then we have a quote, the written agency instructions usually give conflicting direction within their program announcements. When we seek clarification from the agency, the contact usually doesn't know how to resolve the conflict. At least twice we have been told by the agency contact listed in the announcement, just do what you think is appropriate. Okay.

The fourth question was, do you find agency-specific forms readily available on Grants.gov. Most people thought that, yes, they could find the forms. Seventy-six respondents said yes. Twenty-eight said no. The quick . . .

STEVE DOWDY: No, there was no text for that particular one. So we move right on. Question five, do you find the applications easy to complete and upload. And there was pretty well split there 50/50, so maybe the question itself was a little vague. But I think some of the comments, did you have some comments? Oh, there was some . . . easy, we got this a lot. Easy was the wrong word to use.

And the challenge is, we've seen this, the repetitive data entry. You know, you have to put the PI's name on 15 places. Too many uploads with some agencies. No consistency among the agencies. Passing of the baton is cumbersome and inefficient. And slow response times was also listed there.

GUNTA LIDERS: And then this is a fairly standard quote, agencies differ on what is required to be filled out, including which forms are used and the information included in each of the forms. One of our PIs stated, the whole Grants.gov process is needlessly complex, want to invest much more time learning the application process than completing the actual application itself. The interface of the software was restrictive because only one individual can work on the application package at one time.

All right, let's see, moving on to six, do you find you need to consult more than one website for instructions to submit applications. There was a resounding yes. Seventy-seven of you responded and said yes. Twenty-six said no. Some of the general observations, that folks often have to consult at least two websites or as many as four, so there would be the funding opportunity, the Grants.gov website, the agency-specific instructions, and many times there's a university website.

So I know many of us have put up our own websites where we try to clarify what the Grants.gov process is going to be within our own institution. So that's four steps just to fill out the application. Again, inconsistencies between Grants.gov, general agency, and program-specific. There were many comments that really did feel that the NIH and NSF instructions were the most clear, long but clear. And of course, the system-to-system institutions negated the use of many websites.

STEVE DOWDY: Yeah, some of the comments, particularly some agencies require downloading a specific form from their own website, which then gets attached to the Grants.gov. We're seeing this a lot where you do three-quarters of the application in Grants.gov and then go to another website, download Word files that have to be included, or then resubmitted or e-mailed after the fact to program officers. There was many comments about that practice and how are we going to stop that.

Grants.gov website agency, sorry, let me get over here, we submit proposals to three different places in three different formats. We also see programs that require a Grants.gov submission, but then requires to print, sign it in ink, and then e-mail it to the program officer directly and follow up with a paper copy as well. So we've all done this, right? Jean's sitting here shaking her head like you've got to be kidding me. This is the reality of what's going on. And then there was many comments, we hope our system-to-system interface is going to fix this kind of stuff.

Do you find the number and variety of agency-specific requirements sufficiently complex to hinder your ability to meet grant deadlines, and again, split pretty much across the board. The number and variety do complicate and frustrate the process, but universities will ensure that they do what they have to do to meet the deadline.

There was comments about unable to achieve the economy of scales. As long as we're submitting to some in paper, some are optional Grants.gov, some are required, we can't ramp up just one process and achieve economy of scale because there's multiple. Mitigating the scattered deadlines and early internal submission deadlines would help that, as we all know.

GUNTA LIDERS: Okay. Here is a quote, I think this is Steve's, obviously a system-to-system person. Yes, but they hinder more than the ability to meet deadlines. More importantly, it seems to us that the underlying reason for a single standardized application portal is in danger. Why do we have 424 R&R forms and 424 forms? Jean, I think you answered that in the previous session.

Why do the agency-specific forms duplicate so much of the data already entered into the 424 R&R, and why do the funding opportunities carry the exceptions even further by varying the required forms from announcement to announcement even when the funding mechanism is the same. Why are seemingly arbitrary rules, changes embedded in the text of the funding opportunities? All the exceptions are sinking our efforts of creating a fully functional system-to-system capability.

STEVE DOWDY: Not my comment.

GUNTA LIDERS: Okay. Is your institution able to adequately track the proposal as it is accepted and validated by Grants.gov and the funding agency. Sixty-eight of you said yes. Thirty-six of you said no. What we learned was adequately was the wrong word to use. And I think the majority of the comments really went back, again, to that consistency among agencies, because that handshake between Grants.gov and the agency-specific system varies, and that's where I think where the biggest confusion and frustration comes from.

Some systems have a lack of sufficient or university-friendly identifiers and e-mail notifications. One of the comments that we heard was it would be great if we could put

the principal investigator's name in every single e-mail that comes either from Grants.gov or the agency.

One of the big issues was only the authorized official can track. This is not a problem in the FastLane system, so many mentioned that the FastLane system really is the best because numerous people get the e-mails with respect to an application. Some mentioned that there was no automatic notice to the principal investigator, and that left investigators very nervous about not having heard from the agency.

But there's a lack of an instantaneous error check or a validation prior to submission. This comment was heard over and over again. We want to make sure we have no errors prior to submitting that application. That yes, we can do it, but it's not easy without creating some kind of internal log at our institutions. So if we have lots of applications, we need some kind of internal mechanism to track them and make sure that they've gotten to the agency.

STEVE DOWDY: Yeah. We're running out of time so I'll try to speed up a little bit. But the main thing was about the e-mails, the lack of information in the e-mails. And there was an example, it says for the R21 deadline, we submitted 30 proposals and we've received 325 e-mails for those. And sometimes that was ten per proposal.

We expect to submit 150 to 200 proposals for the R01, and that'll generate up to 2,000 e-mails all within a 2-day period. And so the other comments were we need to get that information back to Grants.gov. We don't have time to log in and look at 200 proposals to see which ones are okay. What we care about are the two or three that are not okay and can we get some streamlining there.

Is the ability to view the final application for completeness and proper assembly a positive agency-specific attribute for Grants.gov and helpful in the grant submission. Seventy-seven percent of you thought the answer to that was yes. And general observation, those at agencies that offer this, it's helpful. However, there was a resounding plea for the ability to view the entire application and print functions are not satisfactory.

GUNTA LIDERS: And again, I'll be real quick on the quote. This is at the end of a longer quote. It says, additionally we need to move away from a grant image. We should be talking about the data and not the look and feel of a piece of paper. Okay. Ten, is your institution planning to use the Grants.gov PureEdge product or implement a system-to-system solution. As Steve mentioned earlier, it's about split. Fifty-seven of us are going to be, no. Forty-five of us are going to be implementing system-to-system, 57 PureEdge.

If you look at the demographic data it kind of makes sense because the institutions that don't submit as many proposals are not planning to implement a system-to-system. Some institutions indicated the lack of resources prohibits a system-to-system solution. And others continue to believe that Grants.gov is not in its final form and have postponed the decisions.

STEVE DOWDY: And a lot of people, the problem with the variety of agency-specific forms require constant database changes and programming changes. Additionally agencies are now implementing version two of the forms, which require yet additional

programming. The purpose of PL 106-107 was to streamline the process for the grantee community. All we are seeing is a streamlining at the agency with no, without taking into account the grantee community. Basically I'm paraphrasing some of that.

And then there was when will the system-to-system interface be available for faculty. And then there was observations only for that. Timelines vary. Some institutions have the system-to-system capability or limited, and soon the FY09 capital budgets are approved. So I think what a lot of schools are saying is it sort of hit us by surprise and we did not have time to put this kind of stuff in for our budget cycle at our institution this year. And by the time we can get any of these kind of resource in cycle for our own internal budgeting, they're looking at 18 to 2 years out before they can even secure the funds to try to do this.

GUNTA LIDERS: And some of the comments from the system-to-system schools is that, you know, we're limiting system-to-system, say, to NIH proposals because they find it very difficult to make it available for all federal proposals for two reasons, the large number of agency-specific forms and the constantly changing forms. How will you handle deadlines with a significant volume of proposals if they occur before your system-to-system solution is available.

And quite honestly, we're all going to do what it takes, right? If you're working towards system-to-system, but it's not going to be up, they're going to do whatever it takes to get their proposal in. So do you use PureEdge. Many of you said invoke internal deadline policies, which many of us do that are using PureEdge, or educate the faculty on the importance of timeliness.

Some schools that were heading towards system-to-system really didn't know what they were going to do, and they didn't know if they were going to adequately be able to handle a heavy deadline. And even system-to-system schools are a little concerned about the volumes, because quite honestly, we've just not experienced those sorts of volumes.

STEVE DOWDY: And I think this comment probably comes from Ken over here. Pray, take lots of drugs, cancel all vacation, and invoke lockdown procedures. Was that you, Ken? Are you experiencing problems with the development of proposals utilizing shared access to electronic files. Again, it was sort of a split 50/50 there, 51 are years with 44 days.

Grants.gov limitations were noted, not conducive to collaborative efforts. There was a lot of comments in the survey that only one person can work on the PureEdge file at a time. File corruption continues to be an issue, especially when proposals maybe start on a Citrix environment and a Mac and get moved back and forth. There seems to be still some issues with that. And there's our friend again, the whole version control issue problem that we're all experiencing.

GUNTA LIDERS: Okay. No quotes. We need to move ahead here. Has your institution adequately addressed any issues related to internal transmission due to electronic file size. Again, no surprise, you know, we have to move towards a solution, so most of us have come up with some kind of solution for the big files. As expected, those of us that deal with high volumes of proposals have addressed this issue, and

we're going to talk in the next question how. And those with smaller volumes relied on e-mail, CD-ROM, or flash drives.

STEVE DOWDY: What method of transmitting PureEdge files has your institution initiated. Drop boxes, Web servers, Web upload. Please describe. There was yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. So I guess some people have done everything, but many schools have had to go to their IT and increase and ask for increases to the e-mail size to get the attachments through their e-mail systems. And some schools indicated that sharing practices in this area would be helpful.

GUNTA LIDERS: It was pretty evenly distributed, you know, who was using . . . files, who was using some kind of digital drop box. And I think that is one area where people really wanted to share kind of best practices in this area as to how schools were accommodating larger files.

Are you satisfied with agency-specific solutions to address utilization by non-Windows operating systems. Okay. I think the numbers speak for themselves. The majority of institutions were not satisfied with the current Mac solutions. This is interesting. Some schools appear to be unaware that there was an NIH Citrix solution or a Citrix server that could be accessed. The failure to provide a platform-independent solution was a notable concern, you know, throughout the questionnaire. And this was a little distressing. Several institutions have actually instructed their non-Windows users to find PCs.

STEVE DOWDY: Yeah. We've even heard, some people even said they've had to start buying PCs for their people. Has your institution developed its own capability, Citrix server, Mac users. If so, please describe the type of solution implemented. You can read that. And there was 71 percent said no, so pretty much everybody is relying on either some form of terminal emulation or using the NIH-provided Citrix server at this point in time.

So there was a lot of, you know, yes, you know, we need a Mac solution, we need a Mac solution. But many schools are now in the process of developing resources and buying the hardware and doing all of the work to set up their own Citrix environments, because I think we all saw one of the Grants.gov recommendations. If you're going to use Citrix, we suggest you work on your application from 11:00 at night until 4:00 in the morning for best performance.

GUNTA LIDERS: Is your institution's readiness for Grants.gov dependent upon a Grants.gov Mac solution. Again, we're going to do what it takes to get that proposal in, so 83 institutions said no. General observations, the Mac/Windows issue is noted to be a hindrance but not an obstacle. And schools, again, have developed work-around solutions to this problem. Some rely on their sponsored programs offices to actually complete the application . . . and submit the PureEdge application, or some revert to PCs.

NANCY WRAY: Okay. We're running out of time, and, I know, I'm sorry. So I think what we'll do is provide this up on our website for everyone. I will let you know that we

are planning on taking these results to various areas within the federal government, including OMB. I think there needs, this needs to be articulated.

And so your responses are not just going to end here. We intend to take them forward. Thank you. And I'm sorry to cut you short. We have one last presentation and it's an important one for the organization, and Dick Seligman is going to give an update on the strategic planning process.

DICK SELIGMAN: The strategic part is that we'll still finish by 12:30. There is a rule that meeting planners have known for many, many decades, which is that no matter what time the meeting is scheduled to end, whether it's during the day, in the evening, on a weekday or a weekend, at least two hours before that time the exodus begins. So there's a Darwinian element at work here. And if you look to your right and you look to your left, you'll see what I'm talking about.

The Strategic Planning Committee, which was appointed about a year ago, has been looking into what happens after Phase IV of the FDP, should there be a Phase V, if so, what might it look like, what kinds of issues should it consider. So looking ahead to the end of Phase V, which will be in the year 2014, when some of us may have had the wisdom to step aside and let the young whippersnappers take over, looking ahead to 2014, at the conclusion of Phase V, what might we be able to say about what occurred.

And it's the hope of the Strategic Planning Committee and hopefully of the rest of you that as we look back we'll be able to say the following. First, that we were successful in freeing up faculty time to do research and less administration. Secondly, that we were successful in reducing wasteful administrative activity, whether that takes place within the District of Columbia or on our own campus. And thirdly, and this one isn't worded very elegantly, we would hope that some relief had been provided to grantee institutions by permitting reimbursement of the costs of compliance. That needs some work.

But other than that, the first two sound remarkably similar to what we might have said back in 1988 when the FDP was first created. And so in some ways, we've made a lot of progress. In other ways, we're still fighting the same battles. So the, each time the Strategic Planning Committee gets together, it's a little bit like peeling another layer of the onion, and we get closer and closer. And if we live long enough, we'll get to the truth and we'll get to the strategic plan.

So there's some action items that we are working on. First we need to make some specific recommendations to the Executive Committee and ultimately to the membership of the FDP with regard to the current and anticipated demonstrations and what the future of those activities should be. We need to complete our work in refining the goals for Phase V.

We need to consider organizational models, what is the most appropriate structure for the FDP in Phase V and how can we best organize ourselves to maximize our efficiency and achieve our goals. What about engagement strategies, how are we going to find senior-level officials, both within the government and within higher education, who will recognize the importance of the FDP and will be willing to provide moral and other support to what we're doing.

The Strategic Planning Committee is going to continue its work. And we're hopeful that when we meet again in May of 2007, when the FDP meetings in May of 2007, we will be able to present to you a strategic plan for Phase V, and this will be presented for your review and hopefully also for your endorsement. And it was very strategic of the chair of the FDP to place this session in the last 48 seconds of the meeting because we really are still working very hard to plan strategically. And as any of you who've ever tried to do this will know, it ain't easy. Are there any questions? If not, back to you, Madam Chair.

NANCY WRAY: We're about to come to the end of our meeting. I want to thank a number of the GUIRR folks for all their support in running the meeting and for David Wright for keeping me on target and being the support for the activities. There are a couple highlights I do want to point out. I think the faculty survey, we will have that final report out, and I think that's a very key point for us to take a look at and continue to think about how we can use that in some ways to develop some projects.

I think the other thing I want to, for those of you that were in the terms and conditions, you have heard that, even though, as Dick Seligman likes to comment that Labor Day has come and gone and we haven't seen the publication, right now we are pleased to report that the Federal Register notice is beginning to be developed and we should see something hopefully by the 1st of the year. So I think that that's an important note to make.

And there was a lot of activity, I think we're worried about the Grants.gov. I think what I'd like to comment that I think not all of you heard was that there is now a group greater than three that are looking at the 424 R&R data set so that we can really, they can start taking a look at some consistency issues and looking at the forms that are being developed within the agencies.

That's a very important activity, and I think we give a lot of credit to Marcia Hahn and Trudy Wood and Jean for beginning that threesome to work on that and to knock out an R&R form. But it's time that there is a more constituted committee, and I'm pleased to note I think there are about 13 agencies that are now participating, and I think that's a great step forward.

Are there any other specific committees that want to make a particular announcement? Okay. I'm going to remind you again that we like to have the highlights by the end of this week or Monday at the latest so we can get the summary of the meeting out. And the minutes should be posted to your websites. Thank you very much, and have safe travels. And don't forget to vote.