Sponsored Program Administration
Meeting
February 15, 2017

Welcome
Agenda

• Presentation by Procurement Services
  – Uniform Guidance
  – University Procurement Initiatives

• Effort Reporting

• Pre-Award Updates
  – Avoiding Return without Review: NSF Biosketches
  – Budget Periods Less than 1 Year: How to calculate salary and effort
  – IPR Process and Form Updates

• Post-Award Updates
  – NIH – Good Clinical Practice Training for Clinical Trials

• Adjourn
Mike Unplugged
Procurement Services: Updates and Initiatives
January FDP Conference Key Updates

• Procurement Rules “Go-Live” Date
  – September 2016: OMB committed to defer procurement guidelines until FY 19; and
  – Open up the Micro-purchase Threshold for comment in the Federal Register
  – 11/16: OMB indicated they still planned to issue modified procurement rules (no word since)

• Micro-purchase Threshold
  – National Defense Authorization Act
    • Signed by President 12/19/16
    • Redefines “micro-purchase” in 41 USC 1902(a) to increase from $3,000 to $10,000
  – American Innovation and Competitiveness Act
    • Signed by President 1/6/17
    • Increased micro-purchase to $10,000 for NSF, NASA, or NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) grants.
January FDP Conference Key Updates

• Unanswered Questions Posed at FDP Procurement Session:
  – Does this supersede the extensions by OMB? Will OMB grant a 3rd extension for implementation?
  – Will OMB still grant a third extension to allow for implementation?
  – When can IHEs start using the 10k threshold?
  – What is considered a “clean audit?” (one-off or systemic issue?)
  – What internal controls will be acceptable? How will this be determined?
Uniform Guidance – Federal Register

- New UG updates should be coming soon in the Federal Register
  - Reason for delay is more than MPT is now being changed (initially it was thought to be only the MPT language being changed, but now it is going to be more than just that specific section)
  - Procurement Services will keep you up to date on its website:
    - [http://purchasing.uconn.edu/uniform-guidance/](http://purchasing.uconn.edu/uniform-guidance/)
    - Addition of 1-page talking guide
Amazon Business

• Procurement Services had initiated discussions with Amazon Business in 2016
  – Participation in conference discussions
  – Higher Ed concerns regarding content, liability and taxation

• Sensible approach/strategy has led to pilots at UConn
  – Pilot Program under construction with CLAS
  – Pilot Program with limited Gift Cards program with NEAG
SciQuest

• **University EProcurement Assessment**
  – Procurement Services had led an effort to assess the current state of eProcurement strategy and accompanying functionality heading into the 5th year after the launch of the Kuali Financial Systems (KFS) solution. The goal of this assessment and proposed recommendation is to ensure that the eProcurement functional and operational models, strategically align with and efficiently support the goals and objectives of the University’s research, educational and academic missions.
Lab Supplies & Equipment
RFP Background

• An RFP was released on January 20, 2016 to establish a multi-vendor contract for laboratory supplies and equipment for the research and academic communities at the Storrs, Regional and UConn Health campuses, and BOR.

• Based on the campus survey conducted in late 2015, the format of the RFP was designed to address the desire to provide a comprehensive selection of vendors, thereby expanding the range of product choice available to the research community. This desire is a shift from previous relationships.
The goals of this RFP are to develop options for the University’s research and academic communities in each of the following three categories:

- **Category 1: Full-line distributors:**
  - Offer the widest possible range of supply categories and manufacturers that could potentially meet the highest percentage of requests.

- **Category 2: Limited or regional distributors:**
  - Offer a more limited portfolio and/or support service area. The vendors in this category will provide additional product selection in support of the community’s desire for choice.
  - We have also made an effort to identify small, minority and/or women-owned businesses that would assist UConn in fulfilling spend requirements under some federally funded projects.

- **Category 3: Manufacturers offering direct sales:**
  - Will provide access to products not available through the distributors. Some manufacturers may offer certain product lines or consumables through the distributors, but direct agreements will provide access to the full line of equipment. Typically referred to as Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs).
SciQuest

- **University EProcurement Assessment**
  - Procurement Services had led an effort to assess the current state of eProcurement strategy and accompanying functionality heading into the 5th year after the launch of the Kuali Financial Systems (KFS) solution. The goal of this assessment and proposed recommendation is to ensure that the eProcurement functional and operational models, strategically align with and efficiently support the goals and objectives of the University’s research, educational and academic missions.
RFP Participants: Full-line and Limited Distributed

- Responses were received from the following 27 vendors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Full-line Distributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisher Scientific <em>(Preferred)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VWR <em>(Secondary)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 2: Limited or Regional Distributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOT Scientific <em>(SBA Certified)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Medical Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrepcoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETA Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestNet <em>(SBA Certified)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFP Participants: Direct Sellers and OEMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 3: Manufacturers Offering Direct Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckman Coulter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand-Nu Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
Lab Supplies RFP – Updates & Next Steps

• Contracts:
  – Category 1 (full-line distributors) by March 2017 (Fisher enroute to OAG, VWR underway).
  – Category 2 (limited or regional distributors) by July 1, 2017.
  – Category 3 contracts anticipated to be awarded by Fall 2017.

• Fisher Scientific was identified as the University’s “preferred” supplier.
  – Fisher’s full line of products available on HuskyBuy, along with one SBE-WestNet, OEMs, and any exclusive & self-manufactured products from other distributors.
  – Full line products from other suppliers can be purchased via PO or Pcard, but will not be on HuskyBuy.
  – Private Label products will be on HuskyBuy unless they are competitive with the full line of products from Fisher.
  – Only Fisher and the WestNet distributor may sell Corning.
Effort Reporting Update
Coming Soon!

• Fall 2016 Effort Reports
  – Scheduled to release in mid-March
  – Anticipated deadline in mid-May
• ERC Enhancements
  – Changes to PI Review screen
    • Improved functionality for multi-PI approval
    • Will be releasing in time for Fall 2016 report review
    • Training at March SPA meeting
Department Admin Initial Review

• For each report:
  – Review to ensure recent cost transfers and commitment changes have been included
  – Determine if any cost transfers or commitment changes are required
    • If yes, submit appropriate paperwork and route report back to SPS to be regenerated prior to certification

• Review Effort Report Details
• Assists departmental faculty and staff with completing their reports
# Effort Report Details

Click here to see the full list of commitments for the individual.

This column shows the effort certified by the PI.

These columns display the information used to generate the effort report.

These columns display the information currently listed in the commitments side of the application. These percentages are prorated for the effort reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InfoEd Proposal#</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Paid Amount</th>
<th>Paid Effort</th>
<th>Cost Shared Effort</th>
<th>Total Calculated Effort</th>
<th>Current Commitments</th>
<th>Actual Effort (as noted on effort report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123456</td>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654321</td>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department Admin Final Review

• Review any changes that were made in the PI/Individual step
  – Identify if any cost transfers or commitment changes need to be submitted to SPS
  – Ensure PIs have incorporated necessary changes, if appropriate

• Review Effort Report Details one last time
  – Check for potential validation issues
  – Return report to PI/Individual step if changes are needed
  – Comment on any explanations for unmet commitments when submitting to SPS
Validation Checks

- Students: any changes from the calculated effort will be flagged for SPS review
  - Effort must equal pay
  - Cost transfers may be necessary to accurately reflect expended effort
- Faculty & Staff: reports are flagged for review if:
  - Actual effort is less than pay
  - Actual effort is less than committed
  - Any new projects were added
- All reports with comments will be reviewed
- SPS Post Award may flag additional reports for review
Effort Reporting Do’s for Dept Admins

• **DO: Help your investigators**
  – Take the time to help them understand how to review and certify their reports
  – If they’re not comfortable signing or have questions, STOP! and ask Kristin
  – Forward reports with enough time for them to review and certify

• **DO: Manage your commitments**
  – Verify commitments in ERC when projects are awarded
  – Review the Effort Report Details screen for each report to ensure that all commitments are accurate and all payroll was processed correctly

• **DO: Review your reports**
  – Return the report to SPS or just ask Kristin, if you have a question or see something unusual
  – Keep the validations in mind when advancing reports

• **DO NOT:** Share your NetID/Password or log in as someone else to route or certify a report
Pre-Award Updates
Pre-Award

• **Avoiding Return without Review: NSF Biosketches**
  – Synergistic Activities: each bullet/item may only describe *one specific* activity. DO NOT include a list under each (list of journals they review or societies they are member of).

• **Budget Periods for Less than One Year**
  1. Equate the salary to the appropriate amount for the period of time. For example, 9 month salary = $90,000 with a budget period of 6 months (during academic year), use $60,000 for the base salary.
  2. Base effort on the % effort devoted to the project during that time. For example, 3 months of academic effort would represent 50% of a 6 month period.
  3. Include a note about the shortened period in addition to the dates at the top of the excel budget.
Pre-Award

• IPR Process Updates
  – Retiring IPR Stamps:
    • Less than Required # of Days for Review
    • Submitted Late to OSP Insufficient Time for Review

• IPR Form Updates
  – We didn’t forget your feedback!
  – Integration with UConn Health: new form coming soon
Post-Award Update
Good Clinical Practice Training for NIH Awardees Involved in NIH-funded Clinical Trials

- NIH issued a new policy for all NIH funded investigators and site staff who are involved in the conduct, oversight, or management of clinical trials:
  - The policy establishes that these NIH awardees and clinical trial staff should be trained in Good Clinical Practice (GCP) consistent with the principles for the International Conference on Harmonisation (ICH) E6
  - Applies to NIH funded Clinical Trials
  - Effective January 1, 2017
  - Training is expected to be completed by April 30, 2017 and must be renewed every 3 years
Good Clinical Practice Training for NIH Awardees Involved in NIH-funded Clinical Trials

- The requirement will be satisfied through completion of an online training tutorial
  - Individuals will log in to the CITI website (https://www.citiprogram.org/) to complete GCP training

- Indicate on the NIH application cover sheet that the grant submission is a clinical trial as defined by NIH

- If you have any questions, please contact Doug Bradway at 6-0986 or by email at doug.bradway@uconn.edu

*NIH Guide Notice: NOT-OD-16-148*
Adjourn

• Questions?

• Upcoming SPA Meeting:
  – March 15, 2017, 9:30am-11am, Laurel Hall, Room 201
  – April 26, 2017, 9:30am-11am, Laurel Hall, Room 201
  – May 23, 2017, 9:30am-11am, Laurel Hall, Room 201