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Federal Demonstration Partnership

- A formal collaboration between federal agencies and research institutions
- Increase research productivity
- Streamline the administrative process and minimize administrative burden
- Maintain effective stewardship of federal funds
The FDP Is …

- A place where federal agencies and institutions can evaluate new ideas relative to research administration
- A forum to discuss and evaluate options
- A test bed for demonstrations
History

Phase I (Florida Demonstration Project)
- 1986 - 1988

Phase II (Federal Demonstration Project)
- 1988 - 1996
- 21 institutions/consortia & 11 federal agencies

Phase III (Federal Demonstration Partnership)
- 1996 - 2002
- 65 institutions & 11 federal agencies & 6 affiliate members
FDP Phase I and II Accomplishments

- Implemented (mostly) common, streamlined terms and conditions for research grants
- Increased budget flexibility
- No cost time extensions
- Pre-award costs
- Carry-forward across continuation years
- Technical progress reports / minimal continuation proposals
- Revised OMB A-110
A survey on the impact of these expanded authorities on principal investigators produced striking results—73% of the time saved by PI’s was redirected to research.
FDP Executive Committee

- Barbara Siegel, Northwestern University (Chair)
- Dr. Wendy Baldwin, NIH
- Dr. William Olbricht (PI)
- Dr. Constance Atwell, NIH
- Chuck Paoletti, ONR
- Joanna Rom, NSF
- Sarah Wasserman, University of Illinois
- Denise Clark, Cornell
- Merrilea Mayo, GUIRR
# FDP Committees and Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Terms &amp; Conditions</th>
<th>Electronic Research Administration</th>
<th>Faculty PRD</th>
<th>PRD ad hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>PL.106-107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Cost Sharing &amp; Effort Reporting</th>
<th>Electronic Approval &amp; Routing Systems</th>
<th>Electronic Notification of Awards</th>
<th>Federal Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>Sub-awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completed Task Forces

- Institutional Profiles
- Professional Profiles (Biosketch)

---

**FDP Policy on Participation in Meetings and Task Forces**

**Procedures for Proposing New Demonstrations / Task Forces**
Highlights of Phase III

- Renewing the Government-University Partnership
- Electronic Research Administration
- Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting
- Award Terms and Conditions
- Subawards
Clarification of OMB A-21

- Voluntary uncommitted cost sharing should be treated differently from committed effort and should not be included in the organized research base for computing the F&A rate...

- Clarification for the tuition remission costs of graduate students charged to Federal programs
Electronic Research Administration

- ERA Guiding Principles
- NSF E-Signature Pilot
- NIH eRA Project
- Federal Commons Concept
- Close participation with Inter-Agency Electronic Grants Committee and PL 106-107 Committees
ERA Guiding Principles

**Principle 1:** The interests of the funding entities, recipient organizations, and general public are best served when initiatives that involve electronic interactions between a federal funding entity and recipient organization are undertaken within the context of the implementation of PL 106-107.

**Principle 2:** Consultation with recipients early in system development increases both utility and satisfaction.
ERA Guiding Principles

**Principle 3:** Interoperable systems for the electronic exchange of data in support of grants administration processes are possible only when government-wide data standards, such as the ANSI X-12 transaction sets are used.

**Principle 4:** The promise of electronic commerce in grants administration depends on each funding entity and recipient organization implementing one of the approved data exchange mechanisms.
**ERA Guiding Principles**

**Principle 5:** Funding entities must respect recipient organizations’ need to know what is being proposed by individuals and groups within the organization, and the role organizations play in providing quality control over proposal submissions, and monitoring deliverables.

**Principle 6:** Data should be collected once, at its inception, without redundant data entry.
ERA Guiding Principles

**Principle 7:** Electronic data must be secure from unauthorized access during transmission, storage, and subsequent use by the funding entity.

**Principle 8:** The utility of systems to be used by recipients is greatly enhanced when the systems are pre-loaded with as much funding agency legacy data as possible.

**Principle 9:** Data integrity is essential.
**ERA Guiding Principles**

**Principle 10:** System performance must be adequate for the processes and applications supported.

**Principle 11:** Funding entities are responsible for providing training and support of recipient organization personnel.
eRA today: a comparison (1)

The common face provided by “Mere” e-grants

Finally, E-Grants is really doing great. The people who work on that issue are committed to serving their customers, serving their constituents. And they see this as something that’s really going to help their customers.” Tony Frater (Government-to-government portfolio manager) in GNC.com 08/19/02; Vol. 21 No. 24

Or e-grants “and …”
eRA today: a comparison (2)

...and scores of unique agency systems

- DARPA STC Tech
- DoC DISA EDA
- DoE IIPS
- DoE Tech Reports
- DoEd e-application
- EPA
- HUD
- Joint Proposal System
- NASA Proposal System
- NASA SYS-EYFUS
- NIH Xtrain
- NIH Commons
- NSF FastLane
- ONR Grant Application

“Just be glad you’re not getting all the government you’re paying for.” Will Rogers
A Systems Sampler, “Life is Like a Box of Chocolates”

- DARPA STC Tech
- DoC DISA EDA
- DoE IIPS
- DoE Tech Reports
- DoEd e-application
- EPA
- HUD
- Joint Proposal System
- NASA Proposal System
- NASA SYS-EYFUS
- NIH Xtrain
- NIH Commons
- NSF FastLane
- ONR Grant Application

If every agency-deployed system fully conformed to the FDP Core Principles, simply the number of unique systems would still place an undue burden upon recipient institutions.
eRA eight years ago: a comparison

Technology was perceived as the challenge and it was overcome:

- 1994-1996 – DoE cooperative agreement proved the technological feasibility
- 1998 – NSF Fastlane proved that a system could work in production
- 2000 – The Federal Commons and the common face of government was on the way
PL 106-107

Hosted first Consultation Meeting – September 18, 2000
Organized task force as “mirror” to PL 106-107 Working Groups
## Non-Federal Participants Comments, Questions and Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment (C) or Question (Q)/Suggestion (S) (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C/S</strong> = Try to control “rogue” programs—solicitations that require special types of electronic programs (JAVA, Acrobat) and allow proposals to be submitted directly by PIs, by e-mail, even without institutional clearance; declare a moratorium and establish a standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Problem for multi-funded investigators that Federal agencies (and private) have different formats; also a problem for reviewers—can’t look to a common place for similar types of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Concern that planning, strategies for implementing the Federal Commons will be delayed because of inadequate Federal resources; also FDP has been sensitive to university costs of implementing Commons and Federal agencies need to interact with FDP on ERA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Hopes that effort to make cost principles more “consistent” doesn’t also make them more restrictive (by adding to all Circulars each restriction that currently appears only in one or some, but not all).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C/Q</strong> = Concerned that the electronic group is separate from the other three groups. How will their efforts be integrated; how will they deal with crosscutting issues, e.g., digital signatures, single identifier for Government purposes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Will anyone be looking at the way agencies “expense” grants—problem with DoD—so pooling doesn’t create a problem with expenditure rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C/S</strong> = There should be a national standard and set of resources for compliance education (human subj., financial conflict of interest, scientific integrity); use the Federal Commons as a way to link to those educational resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q</strong> = Since Federal funds flow down to them from States, will the States be required to streamline as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Build on prior work, including OMB study in early 80’s, Grace Commission report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> = Work group should look at underlying cost policy (not just consistency) as it might be the cause of inefficiency and should be considered for changes/revision (e.g., time and effort reporting, MIRalam etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FDP Mirror Groups

- Pre
- Post
- Audit
- Electronic
Pre-Award

Applications Forms/Processes

- Develop data instead of forms
- Allow for computer to computer data transmissions
- Standardize application elements whenever practical
- Reduce data element requirements at time of application (Just in Time)
- Initiate a process for changes in standards
Pre-Award

Terms and Conditions

- Require agencies to provide statutory justification if outside circulars
- Develop standard terms by types of assistance and by org type
- Consider adopting FDP terms for all agencies
Post-Award

Payment Systems

- Reduce systems to 1 or 2
- Encourage pooled payment system
- Standardize financial reporting requirement (272 and 269)
Audit

Audit Issues

- Increase reliance on single audit and reduce number of “reviews” and “inspections” on program specific basis
- Provide better guidance on what constitutes “materiality” in finding
- Enhance cert form to provide enough information to determine if finding relates to prime award
- Accept the clearinghouse as cert for subrecipient monitoring
Electronic

- Develop common electronic application, award, reporting and payment systems
- Maintain standards
e-Grants Emerges Under e-Gov Initiative

- Produce a simple, unified “storefront” for all customers of federal grants to electronically find opportunities, apply and manage grants.
- Facilitate the quality, coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of operations for grant makers and grant recipients.
e-Grant Goals

- Eliminate the burden of redundant data collection
- Define and implement simplified standard processes and data definitions
- Protect the confidentiality, availability and integrity of data
- Standardize the collection of financial and progress reporting data
e-Grants Objectives

- Pilot a simple, unified way to find federal funding opportunities via the Web (7/1/02)
- Work with e-Authentication
- Define standard application data elements (10/01/02)
- Deploy simple, unified application mechanism (10/01/03)
Is the FDP Providing Feedback?

You bet!

Provided extensive input to:

- InterAgency Electronic Grants Committee
- PL 106-107 initiative
- E-grants program office including the business case
- Stakeholder consultation on demand
- Core Principles

Identification, testing and ratting-out rogue systems

Liaison with PL 106-107 committees
Is the FDP Feedback Having an Impact?

Yes,

- Some systems have been reviewed and/or modified
- Some language has been modified in some documents
- Partnership with the Interstate Advisory Group
- Several have placed our day-time jobs in jeopardy
- Contributed to the health of our federal colleagues by helping to elevate their heart rates
Is the FDP Feedback Having an Impact?

But

- Not as much or as often as we would hope
- We’re often surprised
- Rogue systems continue to proliferate
- In the past, our input was not acknowledged
- E-grants business case:
  - Leaves the door open for redefining standards
  - Doesn’t acknowledge the volume of research grants
What Does the Future Hold?

Progress

- The institution of formal leadership is encouraging
- The hard bits are cultural, organizational, and financial – not technical – and these challenges remain
- Without adoption and enforcement of standards, technology choices are moot
What Does the Future Hold? What Needs to Happen?

- Promote e-grants; suppress agency systems
- Got to stay on task and not jump to the latest technology *du jour*
- The Feds need consistent and adequate funding
What Does the Future Hold?

Illuminating Titles

Let’s hope the future doesn’t include more of this:

“Despite lack of new funding, e-gov projects to move forward” GovExec.com, Apr 30

“E-gov chief says managers stand in the way of tech advances” GovExec.com, Apr 23

But instead, more of this:

“President to call for major technology spending increase” GovExec.com, Feb 1
Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting

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

Designed demonstration project as part of PRD-4 activities

Further discussion continuing
Award Terms and Conditions

- FDP Terms and Conditions replaced multitude of agency-specific guidelines
- Most recent version July 1, 2000
- Model for PL 106-107 Pre-Award Committee
Subawards

Charge

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

Subawards Demonstration Project

- We are operating the demonstration project to see how well a uniform subaward agreement form works and to have our institutions keep data on this.
Subawards

- Applicable to all A-110 institutions
- Forms available through the FDP website through the committee section.
- Materials in meeting binder
Title 31, Chapter 63
Assistance Versus Procurement

Procurement contracts - principal purpose is to acquire property of services for the direct benefit or use of the U.S. Government

Grants - principal purpose is to transfer a thing of value to the ......recipient to carry out a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by law...
OMB Circular A-110

AWARD

Awards mean financial assistance that provides support or stimulation to accomplish a public purpose. Awards include grants and other agreements in the form of money or property in lieu of money, by the federal government to an eligible recipient.
The term does not include: technical assistance, which provides services instead of money; other assistance in the form of loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, or insurance; direct payments of any kind to individuals; and, contracts which are required to be entered into and administered under procurement laws and regulations.
OMB Circular A-110

CONTRACT

Contract means a procurement contract under an award or subaward, and a procurement subcontract under a recipient’s or subrecipient’s contract.
Subaward means an award of financial assistance in the form of money, or property in lieu of money, made under an award* by a recipient to an eligible subrecipient or by a subrecipient to a lower tier subrecipient. (Cont.)
The term includes financial assistance when provided by any legal agreement, even if the agreement is called a contract, but does not include procurement of goods and services nor does it include any form of assistance which is excluded from the definition of “award”.
Other Sources

Subawards Versus Subcontracts

- OMB Circular A-133
- FDP Statement on Subawards (9/18/00)
The FDP Subaward Model

- **Result of FDP Subaward Committee**
- **Intent**
  - Simplify university to university agreements
  - Eliminate redundancy
  - Lowest common denominator
  - Least offensive to all
### FDP Subaward Agreement

**Prime Awarded**
- **Institution/Organization:** The Pennsylvania State University
- **Name:**
- **Address:** 110 Technology Center, University Park, PA 16802
- **Prime Award No.:** 2001-41521-01ABC
- **Awarding Agency:** USDA/CRSREES
- **CRA No.:** 10.599
- **Subaward Period of Performance:** January 1, 2002 – December 31, 2002
- **Title:** Research on Corn Growing in Dirt

**Subawardee**
- **Institution/Organization:** Ohio State University Research Foundation
- **Name:**
- **Address:** 586 Woody Hayes Drive, Columbus, OH 43210-1067
- **Subaward No.:** 2180-OSU-USDA-1ABC
- **Amount Funded by Action:** $100,000
- **Estimated Total:** $100,000

### Terms and Conditions

1. University hereby awards a cost reimbursable subaward, as described, to Collaborator. The statement of work and budget for this subaward is specified in Collaborator's proposal dated Sept 1, 2001. In this performance of subaward work, Collaborator shall be independent entity and not an employee or agent of University.

2. University shall reimburse Collaborator for all or a portion of allowable costs. All invoices shall be submitted using Collaborator's standard invoice, but at a minimum shall include current and cumulative costs, subaward number, and certification as to truth and accuracy of invoice. Invoices that do not reference University's subaward number shall be returned to Collaborator. Invoices and supporting documentation concerning invoice receipt or payments should be directed to the appropriate party's Financial Contact, as shown in Attachment 3.

3. (a) If final statement of costs incurred, marked “FINAL,” is submitted to University's Financial Contact not later than sixty (60) days after subaward end date. The final statement of costs shall constitute Collaborator's final reimbursement report.

4. All payments shall be considered provisional and subject to adjustment within the total estimated cost in the event such adjustment is necessary as a result of an advance audit finding against the Collaborator.

5. Matters concerning the technical performance of this subaward should be directed to the appropriate party's Project Director, as shown in Attachment 3. Technical reports are required as necessary. Reporting Requirements.

6. Matters concerning the request or negotiation of any changes in the terms, conditions, or amounts cited to this subaward agreement should be directed to the appropriate party's Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3. Any such changes made to this subaward agreement require the written approval of each party's authorized official, as shown in Attachment 3.

7. Each party shall be responsible for its negligent acts or omissions and the negligent acts or omissions of its employees, officers, or directors, to the extent allowed by law.

8. Either party may terminate this agreement with thirty (30) days written notice to the appropriate party's Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3. Subsequent to any notice of termination, the appropriate party may require payment of the reasonable, nonrecoverable obligations in the event of termination by University.

9. No cost extensions require the approval of the University. Any requests for a cost extension should be addressed to and received by the appropriate party's Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3, not less than thirty (30) days prior to the desired effective date of the requested change.

10. The Subaward is subject to the terms and conditions of the Prime Award and other special terms and conditions, as identified in Attachment 2.

11. By signing below Collaborator certifies the certifications and assurances shown in Attachment 1. Collaborator also agrees that it will comply with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements specified in Appendix B of the FDP Operating Procedures found at http://www.nifa.usda.gov/grants/ftp.htm.

### Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Killean</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.M. Moffat</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By an Authorized Official of University  By an Authorized Official of Collaborator

**Title:** Asst VP for Research  **Title:** Director, Sponsored Programs
Key Elements: Identify Parties

**FDP Subaward Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Awardee</th>
<th>Sub awardee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution/Organization (“University”)</td>
<td>Institution/Organization (“Collaborator”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Name: Ohio State University Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 110 Technology Center University Park, PA 16802</td>
<td>Address: 590 Woody Hayes Drive Columbus, OH 43210-1057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Funded: $100,000
Estimated Total: $100,000

By an Authorized Official of University
Name: R. Killoran
Title: Asst VP for Research

By an Authorized Official of Collaborator
Name: Anne J.M. Moffat
Title: Director, Sponsored Programs
Identify Prime and Subaward Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Award No.</th>
<th>Subaward No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-41521-01ABC</td>
<td>2180-OSU-USDA-1ABC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identify Awarding Agency

Awarding Agency
USDA/CSREES
Identify CFDA Number

CFDA No.
10.500
Identify Period of Performance

Subaward Period of Performance
January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2002
Identify Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Awardee</th>
<th>Subawardee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institution/Organization:** **University**
| **Name:** The Pennsylvania State University
| **Address:** 415 Technology Center
| **University Park, PA 16802**
| **Prime Award No.:** 2001-41521-01ABC
| **Subaward No.:** 2180-OSU-USDA-1ABC
| **Awarding Agency:** USDA/CSREES
| **CFDA No.:** 16.355
| **Subaward Period of Performance:** January 1, 2002 - December 31, 2002
| **Project Title:** Research on Corn Growing in Dirt
| **Reporting Requirements:** See Attachment 4

**Terms and Conditions:***
1. The University hereby awards a cost reimbursable subaward, as described herein, to Collaborator. The statement of work and budget for this subaward as set forth in Collaborator's proposal dated Sept. 1, 2001...to be performed in accordance with the terms of subaward.
2. Collaborator shall be an entity with an independent legal status and not an employee or agent of University.
3. University shall not require Collaborator's consent to any materials for allowable costs.
4. All necessary approvals, i.e., grants, licenses, etc., shall be submitted online to Collaborator's account.

**Amount Funded this Action:** $100,000

**Est. Total: (if incrementally funded)** $100,000

**By an Authorized Official of University**

Name: R. Killoran  
Date: 

**By an Authorized Official of Collaborator**

Name: Anne J.M. Moffat  
Date: 

Title: Asst VP for Research  
Title: Director, Sponsored Programs
Identify Project Title

Project Title: Research on Corn Growing in Dirt
Identify Non-Financial Reporting Requirements

Or you could enter specific reporting requirements…
Terms and Conditions: Award Identification

1) University hereby awards a cost reimbursable subaward, as described above, to Collaborator. The statement of work and budget for this subaward are as specified in Collaborator’s proposal dated ______________ . In its performance of subaward work, Collaborator shall be an independent entity and not an employee or agent of University.
2. University shall reimburse Collaborator not more often than monthly for allowable costs. All invoices shall be submitted using Collaborator’s standard invoice, but at a minimum shall include current and cumulative costs, subaward number, and certification as to truth and accuracy of invoice. *Invoices that do not reference University’s subaward number shall be returned to Collaborator.* Invoices and questions concerning invoice receipt or payments should be directed to the appropriate party’s Financial Contact, as shown in Attachment 3.
3) A final statement of costs incurred, marked “FINAL”, must be submitted to University’s Financial Contact NOT LATER THAN sixty (60) days after subaward end date. The final statement of costs shall constitute Collaborator’s final financial report.
4) All payments shall be considered provisional and subject to adjustment within the total estimated cost in the event such adjustment is necessary as a result of an adverse audit finding against the Collaborator.
5) Matters concerning the technical performance of this subaward should be directed to the appropriate party’s Project Director, as shown in Attachment 3. Technical reports are required as shown above, “Reporting Requirements.”

6) Matters concerning the request or negotiation of any changes in the terms, conditions, or amounts cited in this subaward agreement should be directed to the appropriate party’s Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3. Any such changes made to this subaward agreement require the written approval of each party’s Authorized Official, as shown in Attachment 3.
Responsibility

7) Each party shall be responsible for its negligent acts or omissions and the negligent acts or omissions of its employees, officers, or directors, to the extent allowed by law.
Termination

8) Either party may terminate this agreement with thirty days written notice to the appropriate party’s Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3. University shall pay Collaborator for all allowable, noncancellable obligations in the event of termination by University.
9) No-cost extensions require the approval of the University. Any requests for a no-cost extension should be addressed to and received by the Administrative Contact, as shown in Attachment 3, not less than thirty days prior to the desired effective date of the requested change.
10) The Subaward is subject to the terms and conditions of the Prime Award and other special terms and conditions, as identified in Attachment 2.

11) By signing below Collaborator makes the certifications and assurances shown in Attachment 1. Collaborator also assures that it will comply with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements specified in Appendix B of the FDP Operating Procedures found at: http://www.nsf.gov/home/grants/grants_fdp.htm.
### FDP Subaward Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Awardee</th>
<th>Subawardee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution/Organization:</strong> University</td>
<td><strong>Institution/Organization:</strong> Collaborator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> Ohio State University Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> 110 Technology Center University Park, PA 16802</td>
<td><strong>Address:</strong> 580 Woody Hayes Drive, Columbus, OH 43210-1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prime Award No.:</strong> 2001-41521-01ABC</td>
<td><strong>Subaward No.:</strong> 2180-OSU-USDA-1ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Granting Agency:</strong> USDA/CRSRES</td>
<td><strong>Number:</strong> 10.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subaward Period of Performance:</strong> January 1, 2001 - December 31, 2002</td>
<td><strong>Amount Funded:</strong> $100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By an Authorized Official of University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Killoren</td>
<td>Asst VP for Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### By an Authorized Official of Collaborator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne J.M. Moffat</td>
<td>Director, Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1
FDP Subaward Agreement

By signing the Subaward Agreement, the authorized official of Collaborator certifies, to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, that:

Certification Regarding Lobbying

1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the Collaborator, to any person for influencing or intending to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress, in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the modification of any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or intending to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress, in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the Collaborator shall complete and submit Standard Form 73, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” to the University.

3) The Collaborator shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all levels (subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters

Collaborator agrees to comply with 45 CFR part 76, Appendix B—Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transactions. In addition, Collaborator certifies by signing this Subaward Agreement that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, or proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any federal department or agency.

OMB Circular A-133 Assurance

Collaborator assures University that it complies with A-133 and that it will notify University of completion of required audits and of any adverse findings which impact this subaward.
Identify award/agency-specific general terms and conditions, which can vary by agency or by award. A sample is available for each major agency.
Optional IP Clause for Attachment 2

(c) Intellectual Property

(2) The Collaborator grants to UNIVERSITY an irrevocable, royalty-free, non-transferable, non-exclusive right and license to use, reproduce, make derivative works, display, publish, and perform any copyrights or copyrighted material (including any computer software and its documentation and/or databases) developed under this Subaward Agreement for the purpose of education and research or to the extent required to meet UNIVERSITY’s obligations under its Prime Award.
Optional Data Rights Clause for Attachment 2

(d) **Data Rights.** Collaborator hereby grants to UNIVERSITY license to use data created in the performance of this FDP Subaward Agreement for the purpose of education and research or to the extent required to meet UNIVERSITY’s obligations under its Prime Award.
### Identify Corresponding Parties:
- Administrative
- Project Director
- Financial
- Authorized Official
You can include special technical reporting requirements in Attachment 4.

1. Subawardee shall submit monthly technical progress reports to University Project Director, as stated in Attachment 3.

2. In accordance with 37 CFR 401.14, Subawardee shall notify University Administrative Contact, as stated in Attachment 3, within two months Subawardee’s inventor discloses invention(s) in writing to Subawardee responsible for patent matters. Subawardee shall use Form DD882 to report invention(s). A negative report is not required.

When the prime award is from NASA, use the following language for 2. above:

The Subawardee shall submit to University’s Administrative Contact, as stated in Attachment 3, NASA Form 1679 “New Technology Disclosures” for each discovery of new technology individually, at the time of its discovery. If this subaward is a multi-year award, the Subawardee shall submit to University’s Administrative Contact NASA Form C-3044 “New Technology Summary Report” marked “Interim”. The required NASA forms may be found at
http://cto.pro.nasa.gov/contacts/newtech/newtech.htm,
Subaward Pilot Results

Subcontract
- 6 or 7 page document
- 4 or 5 attachments
- Average 25-30 pages

Subaward
- 4 or 5 page document
- 1 or no attachments
- Average 5 pages
FDP Phase IV

October 1, 2002

- 91 Institutions
- 2 Emerging Research Institutions
- 10 Federal Agencies
- 1 Affiliate Members
"FDP has developed into a vital forum where institutional representatives and Federal agencies can air common concerns and issues, primarily regarding developing processes."
Streamlining and standardizing the research administration process

"The primary focus of the next phase of the partnership should be to advocate for the research community as the various federal agencies respond to the 106-107 mandate. The components of Public Law 106-107 provide some very useful focal points for the next FDP. Pre-award, Post-award, Audit Oversight and ERA are four areas around which to organize the group."
Top Policy and Process Issues

- Common electronic standards for proposal/award and payment processes
- Compliance issues including costs, development of education & training modules, Institutional Conflict of Interest policies, RCR programs.
- Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting
- Sub-Awards and Contracts
Benefits of Participation – Academic Researchers

“It gives academic researchers an opportunity to inject the faculty perspective into research administration issues, as well as a forum to take on broad issues of interest to the research community, such as research outcome measures, the interrelationship of teaching and research, and voluntary, uncompensated effort contributed to federally funded research projects.”
Benefits of Participation - Administrators

“For administrators it offers a chance to help change federal policies and practices that may appear redundant or burdensome through open dialogue with their federal partners and through use of a standard set of grant provisions for all participating federal agencies.”
Benefits of Participation – Federal Agencies

“For federal agencies the FDP is a real-world laboratory for developing and testing innovations.”
Benefits of Participation – Value to the Nation

“For the nation, the FDP saves taxpayer’s dollars and lets researchers concentrate on research.”
Proposed eRA Efforts

Actively participate in e-grants initiative
# FDP Committees and Task Forces

## Executive Committee

## Standing Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Terms &amp; Conditions</th>
<th>Electronic Research Administration</th>
<th>Faculty PRD ad hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web &amp; Communications</td>
<td>Pre-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Post-Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Cost Sharing &amp; Effort Reporting</th>
<th>Initiative to Reduce Administrative Burdens</th>
<th>Private Organization Committee</th>
<th>Federal Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>Sub-awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subaward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to stay involved from the University Side

- Make contact with Federal agencies that have systems being developed that your organization has high submission to
- Join any related mail-lists that are offered
- Attend nationally recognized meetings or visit their websites
  - FDP: http://fdp3.org/
  - NCURA: http://www.ncura.edu/
Accessing the Website

http://TheFDP.org
The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is a cooperative initiative among federal agencies and institutional recipients of federal funds. It was established to increase research productivity by streamlining the administrative process and minimizing the administrative burden on principal investigators while maintaining effective stewardship of federal funds.
Federal Demonstration Partnership

Phase IV

Meeting Information

Policy Statements on:

- Participation at FDP Meetings,
- Meeting Attendance by FDP Institutions, and
- Participation of For-profit Organizations in the FDP

Master Listing of All FDP Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upcoming Meetings...</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agenda / Minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19-20, 2002</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>[Agenda &amp; Info]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9-10, 2003</td>
<td>Irvine, CA</td>
<td>[Agenda and Info]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Executive Committee

## Standing Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Terms &amp; Conditions</th>
<th>Electronic Research Administration</th>
<th>Faculty PRD ad hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web &amp; Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>PL 106-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Award Post-Award Audit Electronic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Task Forces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Cost Sharing &amp; Effort Reporting</th>
<th>Initiative to Reduce Administrative Burdens</th>
<th>Private Organization Committee</th>
<th>Federal Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>Sub-awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The End