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Purpose of the Updates

• The PAPPG was previously revised to incorporate new “Uniform Guidance” requirements (2 CFR § 200). After the first year rollout, NSF has updated the guidance in response to user feedback.

• Language has been streamlined by removing text from the PAPPG that is already displayed within Fastlane.

• Language has been clarified where interpretation wasn’t intended; the use of “should” and “must” was reviewed & revised where necessary.

• Entirely new requirements & procedures have been implemented.
PAPPG Changes: Part I

Grant Proposal Guide (GPG)
When to Submit Proposals

• Where: Chapter I.F.

• What: Proposal’s **must** be submitted by 5 P.M. submitter’s local time.

Fastlane will begin auto-checking this and proposals will be rejected if even seconds late.
How to Submit Proposals

• *Where:* Chapter I.G.2.

• *What:* Proposals must be fully certified by the AOR at time of submission.

Previously, there was an option to provide certifications within 5 business days.
NSF ID

• *Where:* Chapter I.G.4.

• *What:* No user of NSF systems (Fastlane & Research.Gov) should have more than one NSF ID.

If you currently have more than one ID, please contact the Help Desk for assistance.

Fastlane Help Desk: 1-(800)-673-6188
Format of the Proposal

- **Where:** Chapter II.B.2.

- **What:** Solicitations no longer specify font type, size, margin, or spacing requirements.

All proposals now follow the standard format detailed in the GPG.
Format of the Proposal (cont’d)

Standard Format GPG Guidelines:

**Font:**
- Arial, Courier New, or Palatino Linotype (size 10 points or larger)
- Times New Roman (size 11 points or larger)
- Computer Modern family of fonts (size 11 points or larger)

**Spacing:**
No more than six lines of text within one vertical inch.

**Margins:**
One inch margins in all directions
Single-Copy Documents

• **Where:** Chapter II.C.1.

• **What:** Removed the ability to submit “Information about the PI(s)” document

This information is already being obtained through the PI Profile and was determined to be redundant.
Single-Copy Documents (cont’d)

• **What:** Proposers must give both the email address & institutional affiliation when providing the list of Suggested Reviewers or Reviewers Not to Include.

This ensures the intended person is contacted for review; not previously specified in the GPG, but was helpful (& now mandatory).
Proposal Certifications

• Where: II.C.1.d.

• What: AOR Certification regarding Dual Use Research Concern (DURC)

New AOR certification requirement to be included at time of submission.
Collaborator’s & Other Affiliations

• Where: II.C.1.e.

• What: Each Senior Personnel must separately include information for past collaborators, advisors, and advisees based on the time criteria provided.

This information was previously located within the Bio Sketch. The totals for each subsection no longer need to be identified.
Collaborator’s & Other Affiliations (cont’d)

NSF GPG Definition of Senior Personnel:

1) Principal Investigator / Project Director
2) Co-PIs / Co-PDs
3) Faculty Associates

“an individual other than the Principal Investigator(s) considered by the performing institution to be a member of its faculty or who holds an appointment as a faculty member at another institution, and who will participate in the project being supported.”
## Sample / Template Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATORS &amp; OTHER AFFILIATIONS for:</th>
<th>PEARL SLAGHOOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name (last name, first name)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collaborator or Co-Author (last 48 mos.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adder, Horton</td>
<td>EMPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderssen, Tanda</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brelid, Harold</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick, Arthur</td>
<td>PFI, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabugaotau, Kyle</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinik, Matthew</td>
<td>Sandia National Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyholzer, Christian</td>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cover Sheet

• Where: II.C.2.a.(4)(h)

• What: Proposals including International Activities in more than five countries must list “Worldwide”.

Up to five countries should still be listed individually.
Examples of International Activities:

1) International Research/ Education/ Training Activities

1) International Conferences

1) Work in foreign countries
Project Summary

• Where: II.C.2.b.

• What: A Project Summary *may only* be uploaded as a Supplementary Document (PDF) when it contains the use of NSF defined special characters.

If uploaded as a Supplementary Document, the three appropriate section headings must still be present: *Overview, Broader Impacts, & Intellectual Merit*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Characters</th>
<th>Special Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[A-Z]</td>
<td>ä, ë, ï, ¥, ß, ©, A, ã, ë, µ, ¶, §, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a-z]</td>
<td><em>Any mathematics symbols</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[0-9]</td>
<td><em>Greek Letters</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`~!@#$%^&amp;*()_+-={},./&lt;&gt;?:;'&quot;</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carriage Return Line Feed (CRLF) and Enter -- ASCII Control Characters

The Allowed Characters may be copied and pasted, or typed into the Project Summary text boxes.

If Special Characters are copied and pasted, or typed into Project Summary text boxes, they will not display properly in the proposal. If use of Special Characters is required, the proposer must upload the Project Summary as a Supplementary Document.
Project Description

• Where: II.C.2.d.(ii)

• What: Clarified that URLs must not be present within this section.

• What: You must include a separate section entitled “Broader Impacts”.

The language “…of the Proposed Work” was removed from the section heading.
Results from Prior NSF Support

• *Where:* II.C.2.d.(iii)

• *What:* The threshold for funding that must be included in this section was clarified to be awards with a *start date* in the past five years.
Results from Prior NSF Support (cont’d)

• **What:** Language was added to strengthen that *any type* of funding is eligible.

“Awards such as standard or continuing grants, Graduate Research Fellowship, Major Research Instrumentation, travel, conference, center awards, *etc.* are subject to this requirement.”
Biographical Sketch

• **Where:** II.C.2.f.

• **What:** Language added to state that while third-party solutions, such as NIH’s SciENcv, are permitted for Biographical Sketches, the proposer is still responsible for ensuring compliance with all NSF proposal preparation requirements.
Biographical Sketch (cont’d)

• **What:** Language was revised to eliminate the option to upload all of the Bio Sketches in a single file under the PI.

A Bio Sketch must be included for each person named as Senior Personnel.
Salaries and Wages

• Where: II.C.2.g.(i)(b)

• What: Language was revised to demonstrate that, when direct charging Administrative and/or Clerical salaries, the Uniform Guidance requirements are applied.

Uniform Guidance location: 2 CFR § 200.413
Salaries & Wages (cont’d)

2 CFR § 200.413:

The salaries of administrative and clerical staff should normally be treated as indirect (F&A) costs. Direct charging of these costs may be appropriate only if all of the following conditions are met:

(1) Administrative or clerical services are integral* to a project or activity;
(2) Individuals involved can be specifically identified with the project or activity;
(3) Such costs are explicitly included in the budget or have the prior written approval of the Federal awarding agency; and
(4) The costs are not also recovered as indirect costs.
“Integral/Essential is defined as being absolutely necessary. Administrative or Clerical personnel are integral/essential to a project if they are directly supporting the projects statement of work. How Administrative or Clerical personnel are directly supporting the project must be detailed in the proposal, budget and budget justification.”
Participant Support Costs

• **Where:** Il.C.2.g.(v)

• **What:** When proposing for stipends, per diem or subsistence allowances for participants, the costs must be:
  - Reasonable
  - In conformance with UTK policy
  - Limited to the days of attendance and actual travel time required to reach the destination
Participant Support Costs (cont’d)

• *What:* When meals/lodgings are included for the activity at no charge (or as part of registration fees), per diems or subsistence allowances should be reduced accordingly.

• *What:* Per diems and similar expenses *may not* be proposed for local participants.
Participant Support Costs (cont’d)

• *What:* When proposing for travel costs, class accommodation restrictions & the use of U.S.-flag carrier restrictions still apply.

• *What:* If the training activity involves field trips, the costs of transportation are allowable.
Participant Support Costs (cont’d)

• *What:* Language added stating that “Participant Support Costs must be *specified, itemized, and justified* in the budget justification”.

Be sure to give extra attention to the level of detail for these costs in the budget justification.
Visa Costs

• *Where:* II.C.2.g.(vi)(f)

• *What:* Language removed from the GPG as Uniform Guidance covers the requirements within the section covering Recruiting Costs - 2 CFR § 200.463.
Visa Costs (cont’d)

2 CFR § 200.463:

Short-term, travel visa costs (as opposed to longer-term, immigration visas) are generally allowable expenses that may be proposed as a direct cost.

Since short-term visas are issued for a specific period and purpose, they can be clearly identified as directly connected to work performed on a Federal award.

For these costs to be directly charged to a Federal award, they must:
(1) Be critical and necessary for the conduct of the project;
(2) Be allowable under the applicable cost principles;
(3) Be consistent with the non-Federal entity's cost accounting practices and non-Federal entity policy; and
(4) Meet the definition of “direct cost” as described in the applicable cost principles.
Current & Pending Support

• *Where:* II.C.2.h.

• *What:* Language added to specify that you must list internal funds *allocated towards specific projects.*

These should have a specific performance period, scope of work, and dollar amount.
Current & Pending Support (cont’d)

• **What:** Language was revised to eliminate the option to upload all of the Current & Pending documents in a single PDF under the PI.

A complete Current & Pending list must be included for each person named as Senior Personnel.
Special Information & Supplementary Documents

• Where: II.C.2.j.

• What: Language updated to specify the format for Letters of Commitment.

Letters of Support are only allowed in a few rare occasions when required in response to a specific solicitation’s guidelines.
“If the proposal submitted by Dr. [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] entitled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by NSF, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description or the Facilities, Equipment or Other Resources section of the proposal.”
Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC)

• **Where:** II.D.14.

• **What:** Proposing organizations are responsible for identifying NSF-funded life sciences proposals that could potentially be considered dual use research of concern as defined in the *US Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern* and for compliance with the requirements established in that Policy.

http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Pages/default.aspx
Collaborative Proposals

• **Where:** II.D.5.b.

• **What:** Language added to remind proposers that, should a Collaborative Proposal from multiple organizations be funded, *both* the lead & non-lead institution are responsible for their own *separate* annual & final project reports.
Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals

• **Where:** II.D.7.

• **What:** Language was expanded to specify information to include within the Project Description that is needed for review criteria.
Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals (cont’d)

Information to provide within the Project Description:

• (i) rationale for involving animals;
• (ii) choice of species and number of animals to be used;
• (iii) description of the proposed use of the animals;
• (iv) exposure of animals to discomfort, pain, or injury; and
• (v) description of any euthanasia methods to be used.
Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals (cont’d)

• What: Language revised to specify that the IACUC Approval date listed on the Cover Sheet must relate to the approval of the animal-use protocol covered under this proposed work.
Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals (cont’d)

• **What:** *Before an award can be issued,* the NSF Program Officer must receive a signed copy of the official IACUC approval letter that should explicitly state:

  • An animal-use protocol has been approved
  • The proposer’s name
  • The title and number of the NSF proposal
  • The date of the IACUC approval
Conference Proposals

• **Where:** II.D.9.

• **What:** Removed the requirements that the Project Description must include:
  
  • A plan to recruit & support participation from underrepresented groups in science
  • A plan to identify resources for child & family care
Conference Proposals (cont’d)

• **What:** Specified lists of allowable vs. unallowable costs.

*Examples of Unallowable Costs:*

- Meals & Coffee breaks*
- Entertainment
- Alcoholic Beverages
Examples of Allowable Costs:

- Conference Facilities
- Supplies
- Conference Services
- Publication Costs
- Salaries
- Consultant Services/Speaker Fees
- Meals & Coffee breaks (for working meals only*)
- Participant Support Costs
Conference Proposals (cont’d)

• **What:** Language clarified that when outside support is given for the conference (Federal or non), this information *must* be provided in the:
  • Current & Pending Support section
  • Facilities, Equipment, & Other Resources document

However, this information *must not* be mentioned within the Budget or Budget Justification.
Proposal Preparation Checklist

• *Where:* II-1

• *What:* Revised to incorporate the changes made to the GPG and NSF’s electronic system.
Funding Recommendation

• **Where:** III.E.

• **What:** Clarifies the information needed as justification for the NSF Award abstract should a proposal be recommended for funding.

Your Program Officer will request this from you when needed.
The NSF Award Abstract needs to justify the expenditure of Federal funds by:

“articulating how the project serves the national interest, as stated by NSF's mission: "to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity and welfare; or to secure the national defense".”
Questions??
PAPPG Changes: Part II

Awards and Administration Guide (AAG)
NSF Awards

• Where: Chapter I

• What: Has been revised to reflect that requests for NSF-approved extensions submitted after the grant end date must include justification for why they were not submitted earlier.

Language added states:

Requests submitted after the end date of the grant must include a strong justification as to why it was not submitted earlier. The request must explain the need for the extension and include an estimate of the unobligated funds remaining and a plan for their use.
Grantee Notifications to NSF and Requests for NSF Approval

• Where: Chapter II.A.2

• What: Revised to state that, with the exception of significant changes in methods or procedures and significant changes, delays or events of unusual interest, all notifications and requests must be electronically signed and submitted by the AOR via use of NSF’s electronic systems.
# Exhibit II-1

- **Type of Grantee Notification**
  - Grantee-Approved No-Cost Extension
  - Significant Changes in Methods or Procedures
  - Significant Changes/Delays or Events of Unusual Interest in Objectives or Scope
  - Annual and Final Cost Share Notification by Recipient
  - Conflicts of Interest that cannot be satisfactorily managed, and research that proceeds without the imposition of conditions or restrictions when a conflict of interest exists

- **AAG Citation**
  - I.D.3.c(i)
  - II.B.1.b
  - II.B.1.c (Other than Changes in Objectives or Scope)
  - II.D.5
  - IV.A reduced or eliminated
Exhibit II-1  
(Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Grantee Request**</th>
<th>GPG</th>
<th>AAG</th>
<th>Direct Questions to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subawarding, Transferring or Contracting Out Part of an NSF Award</td>
<td>II.C.2.g.(vi)(e)</td>
<td>II.B.3</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First NSF-Approved No-Cost Extension</td>
<td>I.D.3.c(ii)(a)</td>
<td>Program Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second NSF-Approved No-Cost Extension</td>
<td>I.D.3.c(ii)(b)</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Objectives or Scope</td>
<td>II.B.1.a</td>
<td>Program Office***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Disengagement of the PI/PD or co-PI/co-PD</td>
<td>II.B.2.c</td>
<td>Program Office***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Person-Months Devoted to the Project</td>
<td>II.B.2.d</td>
<td>Grants Office, if necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of PI/PD or co-PI/co-PD</td>
<td>II.B.2.e</td>
<td>Program Office***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute PI/PD or co-PI/co-PD</td>
<td>II.B.2.f</td>
<td>Program Office***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI/PD or co-PI/co-PD Transfer from One Organization to Another</td>
<td>II.B.2.g</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-award Costs in Excess of 90 Days</td>
<td>V.A.2.b</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of Administrative or Clerical Staff</td>
<td>II.C.2.g(i)(b)</td>
<td>Program Office***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Costs for Dependents</td>
<td>II.C.2.g(iv)(a)</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangements/Alterations in excess of $25,000 (Construction)</td>
<td>V.C.1</td>
<td>Grants Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation of Funds for Participant Costs</td>
<td>II.C.2.g(v)</td>
<td>Program Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in Project Direction or Management

• **Where:** Chapter II.B.2.e and 3

• **What:** Updated to reflect that, when a grant is being transferred, if funding is requested to support a postdoctoral researcher, a mentoring plan must be provided and the PI must report on the mentoring activities in their NSF project reports.

The same procedures must be followed if a request to subaward, transfer or contract out part of an NSF award includes funding to support a postdoctoral researcher and the original proposal did not include a mentoring plan.
Technical Reporting Requirements

• Where: Chapter II.D

• What: Revised to state that, in the case of annual project reports, the reports should be submitted no later than 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. For final project reports and project outcomes reports for the general public, reports should be submitted no later than 120 days (previously 90 days) following expiration of the grant. Grants will be financially closed out on the first day of each month for all awards with end dates of 120 or more days (previously 90 days) prior to the financial closeout day. Parallel changes have been made to section II.C.3 with regard to annual and final cost sharing reports.
Interest Earned on Advance Payments

• **Where:** Chapter III.D.3

• **What:** Updated with guidance that implements the applicable portions of 2 CFR § 200.305 on interest income.
Interest Earned on Advance Payments (Cont’d)

The following provisions implement the applicable portions of 2 CFR § 200.305 on interest income.

Grantees shall maintain advances of NSF funds in interest bearing accounts, unless any of the following apply:

a. The grantee receives less than $120,000 in Federal awards per year;

b. The best reasonably available interest bearing account would not be expected to earn interest in excess of $500 per year on Federal cash balances;

c. The depository would require an average or minimum balance so high that it would not be feasible within the expected Federal and non-Federal cash resources; or

d. A foreign government or banking system prohibits or precludes interest bearing accounts.
Award Financial Reporting Requirements

- **Where:** Chapter III.E

- **What:** Final Disbursement Reporting, Consolidated Listing of Program- and Cost-Related Grantee Notifications to, and Requests for Approval from, the National Science Foundation, has been revised to reflect that grantees must liquidate all obligations incurred under their awards not later than 120 calendar days (previously 90 days) after the award end date and that NSF will financially close awards 120 days (previously 90 days) after the award end date.
Basic Considerations

• Where: Chapter V.A

• What: Supplemented with language noting that NSF policies which have a post-award requirement are implemented in the grant terms and conditions.
Basic Considerations (Cont’d)

A. Basic Considerations

- Expenditures under NSF cost reimbursement grants are governed by the Federal cost principles and must conform with NSF policies where articulated in the grant terms and conditions, grant special provisions and grantee internal policies. While grantees are encouraged to seek advice regarding the treatment of costs from the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer identified in the award notice, it is the grantee organization that is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all costs charged to NSF awards meet the requirements of the cost principles contained in 2 CFR § 200, Subpart E, grant terms and conditions, and any other specific requirements of both the award notice and the applicable program solicitation.
Administrative and Clerical Salaries & Wages Policy

• **Where:** Chapter V.B.2

• **What:** New section that articulates when direct charging of these costs may be appropriate, in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.413. (See previous slide #26)
The salaries of administrative and clerical staff should normally be treated as indirect (F&A) costs. Direct charging of these costs may be appropriate only if all of the following conditions are met:

1. Administrative or clerical services are integral* to a project or activity;
2. Individuals involved can be specifically identified with the project or activity;
3. Such costs are explicitly included in the budget or have the prior written approval of the Federal awarding agency; and
4. The costs are not also recovered as indirect costs.
Indirect Costs

• *Where:* Chapter V.D

• *What:* Updated the language on predetermined rates in order to conform to the coverage in the Uniform Guidance. In addition, it discusses under what circumstances NSF may elect to set award specific rates.

• Chapter V.D.1.b(i) states: *Where grantees receive limited NSF funding, the Foundation may elect to set award specific rates as opposed to a formal annual negotiated indirect cost rate agreement. In these cases, the award notice will specify the rate type, and application base.*
Passports and Visas

• **Where:** Chapter V.F.4

• **What:** Revised to refer to the Uniform Guidance for coverage on visa costs.

  (See previous slide #33)
Visa Costs (cont’d)

2 CFR § 200.463:

Short-term, travel visa costs (as opposed to longer-term, immigration visas) are generally allowable expenses that may be proposed as a direct cost.

Since short-term visas are issued for a specific period and purpose, they can be clearly identified as directly connected to work performed on a Federal award.

For these costs to be directly charged to a Federal award, they must:

1. Be critical and necessary for the conduct of the project;
2. Be allowable under the applicable cost principles;
3. Be consistent with the non-Federal entity's cost accounting practices and non-Federal entity policy; and
4. Meet the definition of “direct cost” as described in the applicable cost principles.
Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC)

• *Where:* Chapter VI.B.5

• *What:* An entirely new section and serves, in conjunction with coverage in the GPG, as NSF’s implementation of the US Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern. (See previous slide #38)
Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC)

• **Where:** II.D.14.

• **What:** Proposing organizations are responsible for identifying NSF-funded life sciences proposals that could potentially be considered dual use research of concern as defined in the *US Government Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern* and for compliance with the requirements established in that Policy.

[http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Pages/default.aspx)
Public Access to Copyrighted Material

- **Where:** Chapter VI.D.2.c

- **What:** An entirely new section which provides information on NSF’s Public Access Policy. This policy also is referenced in Chapter VI.E.1 on publication and distribution of grant materials.
Public Access to Copyrighted Material (Cont’d)

NSF’s policy on public access to copyrighted material (Public Access Policy) reflects the Foundation’s commitment to making certain that, to the extent possible, the American public, industry and the scientific community have access to the results of federally funded scientific research. Pursuant to this policy, awardees must ensure that articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals and papers in juried conference proceedings:

- are deposited in a public access compliant repository (as identified in the Public Access Policy);
- are available for download, reading, and analysis within 12 months of publication;
- possess a minimum set of machine-readable metadata elements as described in the Public Access Policy; and
- are reported in annual and final reports with a persistent identifier.

Either the final printed version or the final peer-reviewed manuscript is acceptable for deposit. NSF’s Public Access Policy applies to awards, funded in whole or in part, as a result of proposals submitted, or due, on or after January 25, 2016. NSF’s Public Access Policy may be viewed at http://www.nsf.gov/news/special_reports/public_access/index.jsp.

- Each NSF grant contains as part of the grant terms and conditions, an article implementing the public access requirements.
Suspensions and Termination

• Where: Chapter VII.A.2

• What: Supplemented with language regarding NSF’s implementation of the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS).
The Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act of 2009 (Public Law 110-417) was enacted on October 14, 2008. Section 872 of this Act required the development and maintenance of an information system that contains specific information on the integrity and performance of covered Federal agency contractors and grantees. The Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) was developed to address these requirements.

https://www.fapiis.gov/
Informal Resolution of Grant Administration Disputes

• **Where:** Chapter VII.B.3

• **What:** Contains revised procedures to be followed when a grantee disagrees with or disputes a post-award decision made by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer.

Questions??
Contacts

Proposals
Drew Haswell
Sponsored Programs Administrator
ahaswell@utk.edu
974-0035

Contracts
Raymond Norris
Sponsored Programs Administrator
rnorris6@utk.edu
974-1165

OSP Front Desk
974-3466
osp@utk.edu