Federal Sponsor Other Support & International Engagements

March 24, 2022

The information in this document is current as of April 18, 2022.

Questions & Answers

Do you need to include an in-kind section if there is no in-kind support?

Yes. To avoid any confusion on the sponsor's part that something was omitted, you should include an in-kind section with a comment that there is none.

Would you include space that is specifically provided for the project as an in-kind resource and not include the investigator's office provided by their department?

You only need to provide space as an in-kind resource if it is something that is not being provided by U-M. For example, if the University of Cambridge provides lab space to the U-M investigator, the investigator would need to include the Cambridge lab space as an in-kind resource in Other Support.

The U-M investigator's office would not be considered in-kind support, as that is part of their institutional responsibilities.

How does the Other Support for our Research Performance Progress Reports (RPPRs) differ from one used for proposals?

There is no difference between Other Support documents submitted at just-in-time or RPPR. If any of the investigator's **active** support has changed, a complete Other Support document must be included with the RPPR, including both active and pending sources of support and any supporting documents. Investigators do not need to submit Other Support at RPPR if the only thing that has changed is their pending support.

Is there any work being done to automate either the Other Support or Biosketch documents?

We do have the templates available, but we also work with ITS on a regular basis to see what options we might have for automation. In addition, the Federal Demonstration Partnership's (FDP's) Key Investigator Clearinghouse (KIC) workgroup is involved in a cross-organizational effort that includes COGR, APLU, and AAU to advance the concept of a "Uniform CV." KIC is envisioned as a national investigator repository that would facilitate the gathering of required biosketches and other support data that would draw information from existing systems. More information can be found in the presentation slides from FDP's January 2022 meeting.

Who has the ownership of responsibility for correctness and completeness of Other Support? The faculty member? The department? The PI of a grant that involves multiple other co-investigators and/or subcontracts?

Ultimately, the investigator has the responsibility, as they are signing off on that document that it is complete and accurate. However, the institution wants to support our investigators by conducting congruency reviews prompted by international engagements to make sure the information is accurate, the best that we can.

How much above and beyond do we need to go to ensure the documents are completely accurate, especially for activities about which we have no knowledge and don't go through U-M (i.e., outside consulting)?

Do the best you can. If we reach out to you and ask for support in getting these documents updated--that's 100% where you can help and assist us in that process.

Does ORSP typically manage consulting contracts/agreements for PIs? By virtue of it being consulting, doesn't it by definition mean it's outside of their U-M appointment and therefore out of scope of ORSP/U-M handling it?

Sometimes consulting agreements are routed through U-M, just the same as certain editor positions or similar but it’s rare. Most of the time they will be outside of U-M.

Does SciENcv have a place to add an overlap statement? Since NIH requires a research detail statement on Other Support, is there a space for that in SciENcv? NIH does not currently have a template for Other Support in SciENcv but may in the future.

Yes, the NSF Current and Pending template in SciENcv has a space for the overlap statement for each project/proposal. NIH does not currently utilize SciENcv for their Other Support document, though they have stated that they will in the future.

Can you add the overlap statement to your website and maybe other overlap statement examples?

Yes, we can definitely put that text on the templates. Here is one example:

> *None of the active/pending projects listed above represents an overlap of science, budget, or committed effort.*

Does foreign collaboration have to be listed on the Other Support page?

No. This is often confusing, in part because of the January 2020 exercise when U-M required all NIH-supported Investigators to update their Other Support documentation with a new university-generated template. The university, as an institution, added a section in our local template that included collaborations, affiliations, and foreign components, but this is not an NIH requirement. Given the new January 2022 NIH requirements, a new template has been created and is available on the Other Support Reporting website. That said, certain appointments, affiliations, collaborations, and/or visitor information may need to be included as part of an individual entry for a project/proposal or in-kind resource.

Under what situation would we have to provide a contract with a company as supporting documentation that wouldn't be in the award system?

It wouldn't be U-M that has a contract with the company. It would be the individual investigator that has a contract outside of U-M for an activity that's related to research or conducting research that needs to be included in Other Support. We are only providing Other Support supporting documents or items that are not routed through U-M.

So private consulting is what you're saying that would be the main situation?

Mostly. They could also be listed as an investigator on a non U.S. sponsored research project.

This seems like a mirroring of conflict of interest (COI) disclosure.

There is a lot of overlap across the Biosketch, Other Support document, and M-Inform disclosure, but it's not a 100% match as there are things that get disclosed in the M-Inform that do not need to go on Other Support or the Biosketch and vice versa.

Is there a resource or cheat sheet available on how to use SignNow that can be shared with faculty?

Please refer to the following SignNow resources:

- Other Support Electronic Signature Options: SignNow Quick Reference Guide (includes Faculty Instructions for Signature Only)
- SignNow Quick Reference Guide

How does the system know if SignNow was used as opposed to a pasted signature?

It doesn't and that is why we are trying to get the word out that this digital signature is a requirement. In many ways depending on how it looks once it's been turned into a PDF and flattened, if the sponsor came back and asked questions about the investigator's signature, then you won't know and so it's a little bit of a trust model. But based on NIH's requirement, we need to have the supporting data (audit trail) underlying the signature.

How do you create the SignNow e-signature ID and date/time stamp setting?

Refer to the SignNow Quick Reference Guide (page 7, **Settings** section) for instructions on how to add a signature ID and a date/time stamp to your e-signature.

How can we check if an electronic signature on a document sent to the RA from the PI is valid?

The only way to be reasonably sure is for investigators to include their digital signature data (e.g., e-signature ID, date/time stamp) as part of the electronic signature process.

In SignNow, this can be configured in account settings (see page 7 of ITS' SignNow Quick Reference Guide). Note: If you receive a signed document without an investigator's e-signature ID data or a date/time stamp, it still could have been signed using SignNow, but without "E-Signature ID Enabled" turned on.

In Adobe, investigators and project teams should use the menu option for E-Sign > Prepare Agreement. Do NOT use "Fill and Sign" or "Sign Yourself" options. See the Other Support Electronic Signature Adobe Quick Reference Guide for details.

When flattening a .pdf using "Microsoft Print to PDF", the resulting file is huge (5,000k). When printing to "Adobe PDF" the resulting file is smaller (150k). Using "Microsoft Print to PDF" could really cause problems with uploading an RPPR with many Other Support docs, for example. Have others experienced this?

Here are a few options:

1. Adobe has a resource on how to compress a PDF online: https://www.adobe.com/acrobat/online/compress-pdf.html
2. Exporting it to Word and then converting it back to a PDF may remove some of the excess formatting data
3. Saving to Optimized PDF or a Reduced Size PDF
4. "Printing" to a PDF.
    - Go to File > Print.
    - In the Print dialog box, select "Adobe PDF" from the Printer dropdown.

No investigator reports 12 calendar months of active effort or 12 calendar months of active plus pending effort. 12 calendar months of pending effort? not 100%.

No, an investigator cannot report more than 12 months of active effort on their Other Support documentation. When ORSP conducts their review of Other Support documentation, they confirm that the active support is 12 months or less. This does not apply to the pending section since those projects are pending.