Workshop on Compliance with Research Security Requirements and the Associated Cost of Compliance Survey



September 27, 2023



www.cogr.edu



www.linkedin.com/ company/cogr

Speakers

Moderator: Kris West



Allen DiPalma Director, Office of Trade Compliance University of Pittsburgh





David Kennedy Director, Costing & Financial Compliance COGR





Kris West Director, Research Ethics & Compliance <u>COGR</u>





And Special Thanks to Our Workshop Planning Group!!

Lynette Arias, University of Washington,

Theresa Colecchia, Johns Hopkins University

Allen DiPalma, University of Pittsburgh

Stephanie Endy, Brown University

Jeremy Forsberg, University of Texas at Arlington Bruce Morgan, University of California, Irvine Lisa Mosley, Yale University Dan Nordquist, Washington State University

Elizabeth Peloso, University of Pennsylvania

Stacy Pritt, UT Southwestern Medical Center

Maria Soliman, University of Iowa



Workshop Overview

- Workshop Logistics
- Overview of Current Landscape
 - What's been issued? What are we still waiting for?
 - COGR Toolbox of research security "tools" from member institutions
- Some Poll Questions to Get Us Started!
- Overview Cost of Compliance Survey
 - Upcoming Phase II Survey Methodology & Anticipated Timeline
- University of Pittsburgh's Experience
- Breakout Room Discussions
- Breakout Room "Readouts" and Q&A



Current Research Security Landscape related to NSPM-33 & 2022 CHIPS and Science Act Implementation

What we have :

- <u>NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance</u>
- <u>DOD Countering Unwanted Foreign Influence</u> <u>in Department-Funded Research at</u> <u>Institutions of Higher Education</u>
- <u>NIH Foreign Interference website</u>
- <u>NSF Research Security website</u>
- <u>NSF-77 Data Analytics Application Suite</u>
- <u>NIH</u>, <u>NSF</u>, and <u>DOE</u> guidance on disclosures and foreign talent program participation
- Related agency disclosure requirements (e.g., <u>DOE interim COI policy requirements</u>, <u>NASA</u> <u>COI policy</u>)

What's on the horizon:

- <u>Final NSTC Common disclosure forms</u>
- Final Research Security Program standards
- <u>NSF research security training modules</u>
- <u>NSF Research Security and Integrity</u> <u>Information Sharing Analysis Organization</u> <u>(RSI-ISAO)</u>
- <u>NSF final 2024 Proposals and Awards Policies</u> <u>& Procedures Guide (PAPPG)</u>
- Reporting of foreign gifts & contacts to NSF (2024 PAPPG, Chapt. II.B.2)
- Certification to NSF of non-participation in malign foreign talents programs (<u>2024 PAPPG</u>, <u>Chapt. II.D.1.d. & e</u>)



Major Compliance Areas (with associated costs!)

- Disclosures requirements for researchers and for institutions
- International travel tracking
- Cybersecurity
- Training research security & export controls
- Compliance with certifications
- Program structure and monitoring



Research Security Toolbox

- Research security resources from COGR member institution.
- Available to COGR members on COGR Portal (requires log-in to enter portal)
- Have a tool to share? Email Kris West at kwest@cogr.edu
- Link: COGR Member Portal (member365.org)



As of today, which of the following statements best describes where your institution is in preparing for compliance with anticipated research security program requirements?

- a. We've done lots of planning, but we're waiting for the final program requirements so we can analyze them before proceeding further.
- b. We have assessed our current policies and processes that we think we'll be able to leverage to address the requirements.
- c. Between policies/processes we had in place and some we added, we think we'll be good to go.
- d. We bought pizza and sodas and invited everyone at our shop to join this workshop so they can see why leave requests won't be approved after the standards come out.

How is your institution approaching the NSPM-33 requirement for designating a point of contact for research security?

- a. We already had an employee whose current job description encompasses these duties.
- b. We have/will re-allocate these duties to existing employee(ees).
- c. We have/will hire a new employee(ees) to take on these responsibilities.

d. We all drew straws, and I am watching this workshop because I lost.

Who at your institution is taking the lead in research security program preparations?

- a. Vice President for Research Office
- **b.** Compliance Office
- c. Research Security Office
- d. Export Control Office
- e. Office of Sponsored Programs
- f. No single office is taking the lead; responsibilities are shared or we have a committee
- g. Other (tell us in the chat)



How is your institution networking all of the various units that will be involved in implementing the research security program requirements?

- a. Coordinating through a committee.
- b. Non-committee formal communications and planning processes.
- c. Informal communications and planning processes.
- d. We meet at the same bar every Friday night for drinks.
- e. Other (tell us in the chat).

From the list below, please select the top three areas/process at your institution that you think will require the most additional resources (e.g., materials, services, equipment, personnel and associated budget) to achieve compliance with the research security program requirements?

- a. Information technology
- **b.** Export controls
- c. International travel processes
- d. Pre-award services
- e. Post-award services
- f. Conflict of interest/conflict of commitment
- g. Research compliance
- h. Other (tell us in the chat)



Overview of Cost of Research Security Survey, Phase II



Why Another Survey?

- <u>Cost of Compliance NSPM-33 Disclosure Requirements</u>, November 2022
- <u>Cost of Compliance NIH Data Sharing and Management</u>, May 2023
- Survey of F&A Cost Rates (final report, coming soon, at a theatre near you!)

To quote a good friend: "Dave- what new tactics can we try to convince federal agencies and Congress that the admin/costing issues around these mandates are killing us!!"

Data-Driven Evidence

First and most importantly, we appreciate your willingness to participate in the upcoming survey. The results will inform COGR's ongoing advocacy efforts describing the impact of administrative burden on the quality of science, the everincreasing cost of compliance, and the intersection with how the American public values the contribution of science to its standing in the global socio-political economy. Second, the results of the survey provide COGR with a rich set of data from a diverse population of research institutions, which allows us to respond to these critical issues with data-driven evidence.

Survey Approach ...

Assign "Burden Factors" to a matrix capturing "Compliance Requirement" and "Organizational Unit."

Burden Factors (used in DMS Survey):

- **1 Low Impact** (e.g., no new staff, no reallocation of existing staff effort, no new training, no new IT/technology, etc.)
- **2 Low/Moderate Impact** (e.g., no new staff, some reallocation of existing staff effort, some new training, some new IT/technology, etc.)
- **3 Moderate/High Impact** (e.g., consideration of new staff, more significant reallocation of existing staff effort, new training, new IT/technology, etc.)

4 – High Impact (e.g., serious consideration of new staff, significant reallocation of existing staff effort, significant new training, significant IT/technology, etc.) **COC**

For Example ...

Compliance Requirement #1, NSF Reporting Module:

Vice President of Research **Compliance Office Research Security Office Export Control Office Office of Sponsored Programs Researchers/Faculty/Pls Graduate Students** Other



And Ultimately ...

Compliance Requirement #1, NSF Reporting Module:

Compliance Office Office of Sponsored Programs



Burden Factors of **3–Moderate/High Impact** and **4–High Impact** can be translated into \$ figures, which allows us to estimate the cost of compliance both for a specific compliance requirement and for a particular organizational unit (including faculty!)

University of Pittsburgh's Experience



<u>Hypothetical</u> Timeline for Schools to Become Compliant with Research Security Program Requirements

March 7, 2023

NSF Releases Federal Register Notice announcing proposed research security program rules for public comment.

<u>Comment period is 90 days; June 5th was the deadline.</u>

October 2023 – June 2024

Upon receipt of the research security standards, relevant research agencies should engage with external stakeholders to ensure that program requirements are appropriate to the broad range of organizations that are subject to the requirements.

OSTP will complete the standardized requirement in the subsequent 120-days, and, upon completion, work with OMB to develop a plan to implement the standardized requirement.

OSTP Follow-up is 120 days. Early October is the deadline.

October 2023 – June 2024

Covered Research Organizations have <u>ONE</u> <u>YEAR</u> to develop/implement compliant Research Security Programs from the release of Final Rule for Research Security Programs.





Actions Taken/Preparations Made

- Socialization: Constant and multi-directional
- <u>Responsible Office:</u> The Office of Research Security & Trade Compliance (ORSTC)
- <u>POC:</u> ORSTC Director (A. DiPalma)
- <u>RS Website: In development</u>
- <u>RS Policy Creation/Oversight:</u> Undecided
- <u>Policy Review/Creation:</u> Data Governance, Human Data/Tissue Sharing, COI, Outside Employment/Consulting, Academic Visitors, IT Security and Reporting, Export/CUI
- <u>Capital Budget Request based on NSMP-33</u> <u>Implementation Guidance:</u> Provost, SVC Research, CFO, Travel, IT Security



Pitt Research Office of Research Protections

August 2023 Newsletter

Stay up-to-date with the latest news and resources from the Office of Research Protections (ORP)

Common Funding Agency Disclosure Forms for Other Support and Biographical Sketches

Pitt Research

<u>Pitt RS Budget Request Based on</u> NSPM-33 Implementation Guidance

Foreign Travel Security	Cybersecurity	Research Security Training	Export Controls, Institutional Support
 Personnel: Global Operations Support Director International Travel & Safety Coordinator/Data Analyst 	 Personnel: Security Engineer GRC Analyst Threat and Incident Analyst 		Personnel: • Disclosure Compliance Director
 Non-Personnel: Global Operations systems support ISOS report Integration & training Concur pre-registration software & implementation 	 Non-Personnel: CUI: GCC High Configuration, set-up, third party consultant CUI: GCC High G5 Licenses Cyber Organizing & Tracking system for reporting 	Non-Personnel: • LMS Management System tracking & certification adoption & integration (perhaps CITI?)	Non-Personnel: • Disclosure integration costs: multiple system upgrades for COI, OSP, Export Controls, Visitors, RS Training (perhaps CITI?)

Pitt Research



Through the magic of the internet, let's Zoom to our breakout rooms!!!!





Welcome back. We'll resume shortly.



Breakout Room Readouts



BY

This Photo by Unknown Author is licensed under CC