

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON ACCOUNTABILITY IN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH FUNDING

Summary Report

June 22-24, 2011
Brussels, Belgium

INTRODUCTION

On June 22-24, 2011, The European Commission and the U.S. National Science Foundation co-hosted an international workshop on managing risks and accountability challenges.

The 2011 Workshop was the ninth in a series of annual workshops. The first workshop was held in Paris in 2003 and focused on organizational structures and research and technology missions of the represented funding organizations. The overall goal of the 2011 workshop was to gather officials from international research organizations responsible for the oversight of research to discuss new or existing challenges and exchange experiences and best practices.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the workshop this year was to discuss issues related to accountability responsibilities, oversight, and compliance in scientific research projects. The agenda is contained in **Appendix A**. The workshop presentations this year focused on three basic themes:

- 1) Striking the proper balance between accountability, sound financial management, and the need for simplification.
- 2) Identifying and managing fraud risk from the perspective of a research funding organization.
- 3) Using technology for fraud prevention and detection

INVITEES

Invitees were individuals with responsibility for operating programs to administer, oversee and/or prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in government-funded science and engineering programs. Government funding agencies and some research universities and institutions were also represented. International attendees and their affiliations are listed in **Appendix B**.

OVERVIEW

The National Science Foundation and the European Commission co-hosted the workshop this year in Brussels, Belgium. Organizers from the National Science Foundation were Allison Lerner, Inspector

General; Kristen Cutforth, Assistant Counsel to the Inspector General; and Brett Baker, Assistant Inspector General for Audit. From the European Commission, the co-hosts were Marc Bellens, Head of Unit - External Audits, Anne Verriest, and Sabine Gruener, Administrator-External Audits.

NARRATIVE SUMMARIES

Wednesday, June 22

Welcome & Introductions

Franco Biscontin, Director Management Operational Support – Framework Programme, Directorate-General for Research & Innovation

Allison Lerner, Inspector-General, US National Science Foundation

Theme 1: Balancing Accountability\Sound Financial Management and the Need for Simplification

Marc Bellens, Head of unit "External Audits", Directorate-General for Research & Innovation

The Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (abbreviated FP) is the European Union's main instrument for funding research in Europe. The current 7th Framework Programme runs from 2007-2013 with a total budget of over € 50 billion. The FP's main strategic objectives are to strengthen Europe's scientific and technological base and to encourage its international competitiveness, while promoting research that supports EU policies.

The presentation explains the challenges public research funding organizations such as the European Commission are facing, namely to strike the right balance between trust and control and between risk-taking and risk avoidance, while at the same time ensuring accountability and sound financial management of the research funds.

In 2006, the European Commission failed to provide sufficient assurance on RTD expenditure due to low audit coverage of FP beneficiaries, a situation causing criticism by the European Court of Auditors. As a consequence, the European Commission designed specific FP6 and FP7 Audit Strategies and reinforced substantially its audit activities in the research sector, especially because in the accountability framework of the Commission, the European Court of Auditors tolerates 2 % of "error" and is critical towards the management of expenditure which shows a higher error rate. The result of these intensive audit campaigns was that FP beneficiaries complained about excessive audits and controls.

One of the sources of errors being the complexity of the regulatory framework, in this context, the European Commission is committed to simplify the implementation of the FPs. A series of simplification measures were already introduced in FP7 compared to FP6 leading to significant improvements in certain areas (e.g. reduction in the number of documents to be provided, financial capacity checks only for coordinators and for projects above €500,000, convergence of IT-systems, longer reporting periods (18 instead of 12 months), improvement in guidelines and assistance to the beneficiaries).

On 24 January 2011, the European Commission decided on further simplification measures such as wider acceptance of usual accounting practices, a more coherent application of rules by the different European Commission services, and a flat-rate system for charging personnel costs in FP7 projects for SME owners.

The European Commission is currently elaborating the legislative proposals for Horizon 2020, the new EU Programme for Research and Innovation, that will be introduced post-2013. Simplification plays a prominent role in this respect. But of course simplification has its limits as well; to what extent will simplification reduce the error rate and lessen the burden of control on the beneficiaries?

In conclusion, the balance to be struck in the Commission is between simplification, trust of the beneficiaries on the one hand and assurance, accountability on the other hand. In 2006-2007 the focus was very much on audit and control, and now the focus is on simplification and having a more trust-based approach towards our beneficiaries.

Balancing Accountability and Simplification: Research Councils UK: Research, Efficiency and Assurance in the New World

Gareth MacDonald, Head of Assurance, Research Councils, United Kingdom

Universities in the United Kingdom introduced full economic costing at project level in 2005 as a direct response to emerging concern about the sustainability of the research that they undertook. This exercise helped determine the exact funding shortfall they were experiencing and provided an impetus to funding bodies to better support the research that they commissioned. The project was supported by a significant injection of additional funding from government to reduce the deficit.

The transition to full economic costing led to universities developing a better understanding of the costs of undertaking research. However, this did not directly equate to any direct drivers for introducing efficiency into the process. A review of the process published in 2010 recommended that a project should be initiated to do just that.

There is inevitably a level of tension between the introduction of efficiencies into the research costing process and the ongoing commitment to funding sustainable research. The UK Research Councils are at the beginning of this process and will be monitoring behavioural trends very closely.

The presentation provided an overview of this process and concluded with a summary of how the assurance process has had to adapt to this changing funding scenario including how it can begin to focus on measuring efficiency in the research funding landscape.

Research Funding at the National Science Foundation (NSF)

Martha Rubenstein, Chief Financial Officer, National Science Foundation, United States

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent United States agency created by the Congress in 1950 to promote the progress of science; advance the national health, prosperity, and

welfare, and to secure the national defense. NSF fulfills its mission and goals by issuing awards for scientific research that have been judged the most promising by a rigorous and objective merit-review system. As described in its current strategic plan, NSF's goals are to Transform the Frontiers, Innovate for Society, and Perform as a Model Organization.

NSF requests its funding through the U.S. Congress and for Fiscal Year 2012 has submitted a request of \$7.767 billion. This request, would allow NSF to invest in the building blocks of American innovation, promote competitive markets that spur productive entrepreneurship, and catalyze breakthroughs for national priorities. Further, it would enable NSF to boost its proposal funding rate, which is currently in decline.

Proposals at NSF are evaluated through a vigorous merit review process, which NSF considers to be a gold standard. Proposals are evaluated by independent reviewers consisting of scientists, engineers, and educators, who do not work at NSF or the institutions that employ the proposing researchers. All NSF proposals are evaluated through the use of two merit review criteria: Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts. Merit reviewers provide a review of the proposal and a recommendation on funding as well as feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals to the proposers. NSF Program Officers make funding recommendations guided by program goals and overall portfolio considerations, while NSF Division Directors either concur or reject those recommendations.

The award management philosophy is that NSF is an assistance agency with research is carried out by the awardee. NSF has an integrated oversight enterprise where its program offices in its scientific directorates provide oversight of the scientific progress of research awards while its office of Budget, Finance and Award Management provides oversight of compliance and business assistance.

Currently, there are three areas of emphasis in NSF policy. First is within the responsible conduct of research. Institutions must provide training and oversight in the responsible conduct of research to undergraduates, graduates, and postdoctoral researchers. Second, is data management. Investigators are expected and encouraged to share data samples, physical collections and other materials created or gathered under NSF awards. The final policy emphasis is the mentoring of postdoctoral researchers. Proposals supporting postdoctoral researchers must include a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided.

Balancing Accountability and Simplification: the “missing link”

Edwin Croonen, Head of Unit Internal Audit, European Commission, DG RTD

The discussion on the balance between accountability and simplification often (implicitly) assumes that having more of one means having less of the other, i.e. more simplification means less accountability. The presentation states that accountability is a way to give assurance that objectives have been met and resources have been used properly, but this assurance is never absolute: it is a reasonable assurance that implies accepting risk. Therefore, risk is the missing link to connect accountability and simplification.

The central thesis of the second part of the presentation is that our intuition will often mislead us as regards assessing risk and therefore it is better to quantify your risk assessment - even in a very basic scheme- than to let your intuition lead you into erroneous decision making.

So a possible way forward to solve the aforementioned balance would be to choose for those simplification(s) with the lowest risk: from risk-free to risk-removing to risk-shifting. Harmonisation is also a way of removing risk in that it confronts beneficiaries with one clear line of behaviour by the funding organisation.

Conclusion: SIMPLIFICATION HAS A PRICE and there must be political will to « pay » that price, but if we are to choose between options we should consider paying the lowest price, i.e. do the simplification that have the lowest associated risk.

Promoting Good Research Conduct

Ian Carter, Director of Research and Enterprise, University of Sussex, United Kingdom

Promoting good research conduct is as important as identifying and dealing with misconduct, as it has the effect of raising the quality of the research and related activities.

There are various indicators that show that there is a small proportion of bad practice; e.g. Fanelli, 2009, indicates in response to a survey that nearly 2% admit to bad practice. That does not mean that 98% are operating good practice. Indeed, in the same survey 34% admit to using questionable research practices. So whilst we must have adequate processes for identifying and dealing with misconduct, it is also important to address poor practices. Doing the latter could potentially affect a significant proportion of research.

The University of Sussex is in the process of completing an update of its policy dealing with research misconduct, to reflect changes in internal and external circumstances and requirements. We have taken this opportunity to bring together the policies and processes applying to staff and students. It has also meant some revisions to our Code of Practice for Research, but we also anticipate a more substantial revision of this guide, to reflect promotion of good practice. What else might we seek to do?

The means for promoting good practice might include:

- Written guidance, in various forms
- Embedding good practice checks in processes, e.g. internal review mechanisms
- Cultural approaches, e.g. use of role models, and leading from the top
- Training, including decisions about when it should be mandatory
- Audit, delivered in a constructive manner
- Performance indicators, showing both positive and negative performance
- Control measures

Are there already some common, agreed standards of good practice, at practical level that researchers can implement them? What can funders along with institutions do to highlight and promote good practice as part of their assurance and communication processes?

Proper Balance Between Accountability/Sound Financial Management and the Need for Simplification at the Danish National Research Foundation

Thomas Sinkjær, Director, The Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF), Denmark

The Danish National Research Foundation was established in 1991 as an independent organization with the objective to promote and stimulate basic research at the highest international level at the

frontiers of all scientific fields. The foundation spends approximately 400 million DKK (~ 53 million euro) annually and a Center of Excellence program is the primary funding mechanism.

Trust is an important part of the DNRF funding mechanism. We believe in “freedom with responsibility”, so we trust top researchers with large and flexible grants. We expect our researchers to deliver potentially groundbreaking results. The question is: Should we monitor more closely for our own peace of mind, or should we allow top researchers a free hand in addressing the challenges that intrigue them the most?

The DNRF is a funding unit – not a university. The DNRF builds upon the existing university infrastructure and DNRF grants are to be administered according to the university’s rules for research grant funded activities.

Financial accountability

The Cooperation agreement is a detailed, comprehensive three-party agreement (the foundation, the university, the center leader). Annual accounts include specified center staff lists, the institutional co-financing confirmation, and the center leader’s declaration of all other employment or remunerated activity. DNRF’s financial contact with grant holder during grant period includes salary for administrative staff included in DNRF grants (ensuring local administrative skills), introductory information meetings for administrative center staff, annual visit by foundation’s accountant officer, and demand for a quarterly center budget revision.

Scientific accountability – part of the financial accountability

Given the significance of a DNRF grant, fairness, quality, and transparency are key words in the assessment processes. Each application is sent to three high-level international experts within the relevant scientific area(s) for external peer review. A midterm evaluation is carried through after 5 years (one-day site visit by individual panel consisting of 3 international experts for each center – joint panel evaluation report). A final evaluation is carried through after 9 years (written peer review by 3 international experts – each reviewer writes an evaluation report).

Research activities are described in the annual report, and an appendix including indicators must be filled out in addition to the written report. The DNRF takes a keen interest in the development of the centers and visit each one annually at follow up meetings where the chairman and two other members of the board represent the foundation

No cause for concern?

For the past year there has been an increasing focus on scientific and financial fraud. So far, we have been pleased with our “keep it simple” strategy and so far, we have not experienced that our trust has been abused. The question is: Are grant conditions adequate and can we trust the financial and scientific documentation?

Thursday, June 23

Theme 1: Balancing Accountability\Sound Financial Management and the Need for Simplification

The French National Research Agency: ISO 9001 Certification at ANR

Michel Griffon, Science Advisor, Office of the Director, National Research Agency (ANR), France

The French National Research Agency (ANR) is a public organization devoted to competitive project-based funding in both fundamental and applied research and based on international standards. Its objectives are: promoting creativity; bringing more flexibility and, subsequently, reactivity to the French research system; and increasing competitiveness while maintaining a good balance between fundamental research and applied research. To do this, ANR initiates, on average 55 to 60 proposal calls each year. In response, the agency receives and peer-reviews approximately 6000 proposals, of which 1300 (or 22%) are funded. Of these funded projects, approximately 400 k€ is provided to academic projects, while 760 k€ is provided for projects in public/private partnership.

ISO 9001 is a standard for quality management that ensures that an organization meets the needs of its stakeholders. To become certified, an organization must describe all of its management processes, document its procedures, and ensure they are followed-up, traced, recorded, and measured. All performance is regularly reviewed (internally), and annual audits (external) for certification are conducted that contain remarks for improvement and sensible points for freezing processes. Within the ANR, three main processes involving research proposals and funding have gone through the rigorous process to receive ISO 9001 certification: Programme Planning, Selection, and Follow-up and Assessment.

There have been many impacts to the ANR from the process of seeking and achieving ISO 9001 certification. First, is the obligation for quality management, including a greater respect for rules and room for improvement. Next, is the notion of seeking accountability first. Additionally, there has been a greater attention to fraud risk – in particular with respect to conflicts of interest. ISO 9001 certification has also led to a low cost for management (currently 3.2% of total budget). There is an increased legitimacy and fairness recognized within the community for the three main processes that have received certification. Finally, ISO 9001 certification facilitates the respect of independence of the institution.

Use of Management Technologies at the Newly Established Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (OIST) to Meets its Multiple Accountability Requirements

Patrick Vincent, Director of Finance and Human Resources, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology, Japan

The Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (OIST) is a new Institution being established in Okinawa, a subtropical island in the Southern part of Japan, that aims at becoming a world class research center and Graduate University. Initiated by the Japanese Government, and formalized in March 2002 in the Okinawa Promotion Special Measure Act, the project actually started with the creation of the OIST Promotion Corporation (OIST PC) in March 2005. OIST PC has a Status of Independent Administrative Institution (publicly funded entities regulated under specific provisions) with the specific mandate of building the research center in Okinawa and prepare for the establishment of the Graduate University.

The former objective (research center) is well under way with research teams and laboratory facilities in full development. The later involves a complex process by which a detailed dossier is submitted for

accreditation to the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). This voluminous document is a “Business Plan” that describes the future University’s goals, curriculum and courses, teaching facilities, faculty members etc. for the first years of activity, but also the “School Corporation” organization, governance, medium term plans, income sources, fixed assets etc.

OIST PC submitted the accreditation documents in March 2011, and according to plan, the accreditation of OIST Graduate University by MEXT is expected in fall 2011. At that time, OIST PC will cease to exist and become overnight the definitive OIST School Corporation (OIST SC) and Graduate University.

This will be a very significant event, coming with considerable administrative changes in governance, audits and controls, as well as new accounting standards, budget execution rules and legal financial reporting, etc.

OIST PC has been working to prepare this momentous event for more than 2 years and took this opportunity to develop an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system which will embrace all the functions and processes of the new entity including research and schools affairs. Because of these rather complex requirements and the need of bilingual Japanese and English interfaces, the system is based on a modular architecture with commercial packages carefully selected for their ease of customization, and data exchanges. It is expected that this IT infrastructure will enable OIST to improve its administrative efficiency while pursuing its development. A set of measurements is under consideration to quantify and monitor this.

User groups were intensively involved from the very origin of the project and management of change is considered as a key factor of success for an implementation that allows for only one chance, one day in November 2011.

The Financial Aspects of Supporting Basic Research at Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA)

Andrea Balla, Head of Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA), Hungary

Basic and applied research, development, and innovation rely on two cooperating funding agencies in Hungary: the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA), with a yearly budget of approximately 20 M Euros, and the National Office for Research and Technology (NORT). However, all research universities, institutions of higher education, and the research institutes of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences primarily depend on OTKA to finance their basic research activities. The budget of OTKA is determined by the Parliament each year, based on recommendations from the Hungarian Ministry of Finances.

At any time point OTKA is handling approximately 1000-1500 contracts and the same amount of proposal is handled in each year.

Research proposals undergo three levels of review: expert review, panel meeting review with ranking lists, and final review and approval by the Scientific Colleges and OTKA Committee. During peer

review and before signing the contract (for 3-4 years) the proposal budget is evaluated, and corrected through negotiation if needed. If the proposal budget request is deemed unrealistic by the peer review or OTKA Committee, a 25% reduction is possible. Once approved, the Principal Investigator must submit a financial plan identifying anticipated research project costs for up to 12 months intervals (interval length can be flexible). At the end of each interval, the Principal Investigator must submit a summary financial and scientific report. Continuous, uninterrupted financing depends on OTKA's receipt of accurate reports.

The financial plan is flexible and can be modified if scientifically justified in writing to the head of the Scientific College. About 35% of the projects will request and will be granted budget modifications. No cost extensions are possible and unspent funds can be used for extending the projects for another period. Misspent funds must be reimbursed to OTKA at the end of the award period and historically have ranged about 1 percent of the award amount. Allocation of funds to specific awards from the 3 Scientific Colleges is based on needs of the Principal Investigator and foregoing analysis of different cost categories.

Accountability and Simplification: Is this an Oxymoron? A Case Study

Lynne Chronister, Assistant Vice Provost for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Washington, United States

In the business of research administration, of the cornerstone principles for many years has been “we have a problem-we need to write a new policy”. Numerous factors led to this typical response to issues that have arisen from instances of non-compliance or even just the fear of non-compliance. Some of the more prominent motivators include:

- Lack of resources at the organization to fully address the situation,
- Lack of a firm understanding of organizational responsibilities,
- Increased accountability requirements from government and private sponsors,
- Increase in number of researchers contributing to growth in the body of knowledge and,
- Increase in number and complexity of audits.

Being responsive to increased accountability and new regulations is a necessity. The question arises, however, about whether or not business processes can be simpler, more efficient and more effective even in an environment of increased regulatory burden. The University of Washington, Office of Research began asking this question almost four years ago. As a result, the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) has been undertaking a comprehensive review of all research related policies and all business related processes. The ultimate goal is to reduce administrative burden on the faculty and campus administrators and concurrently instill an even greater culture of compliance and conscience across the campus. To achieve this goal OSP :

- Has re-aligned the office structure,
- Instituted a permanent process improvement and training unit,
- Formalized its process improvement strategies and tactics and,
- Delineated clear priorities and timelines.

The benefits are both improved accountability, improved service to clients both within the University of Washington campus and with our external sponsors and partners. We can now say definitively “Accountability and Simplification is not an Oxymoron!”

Theme 2: Identifying and Managing Fraud Risk

Research Council of Norway (RCN) Fraud Case Study

Trine Tengbom, Director, Internal Audit and Heidi Eriksen, Advisor, Internal Audit, The Research Council of Norway, Norway

Trine Tengbom and Heidi Eriksen presented a hypothetical fraud case, based on elements from a real case with the Research Council of Norway.

Presentation of a Case

Maurizio Dal Toso, External Auditor, European Commission, DG Research and Innovation

Maurizio Dal Toso presented a hypothetical fraud case, based on elements from an ongoing actual fraud case with the European Commission.

Framework for Audit Oversight

Brett Baker, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, United States

The *Framework for Audit Oversight* presentation provided Accountability Workshop participants with insight on the field of forensic audit, including tools, techniques, and case study applications. Forensic auditing is a discipline that can complement and support traditional audit approaches. Forensic audit specifically looks for financial misconduct, abusive or wasteful activity using automated audit tools and techniques against financial and operational transaction-level data. In contrast to traditional audit approaches, forensic audit uses a 100% review approach where every transaction is examined in an automated manner against pre-defined business rules and fraud indicators. Forensic audit provides audit organizations with a stronger oversight capability that allows for focused attention on potentially questionable activities.

Data analysis software used in audit and investigative organizations have the capability to perform sophisticated comparisons and analyses against a large volume of financial and operational transactions. These tools allow auditors and investigators to identify anomalous activity within a data file and between data files. The tools can provide the users with information about the underlying transactions without applying business rules or fraud indicators. Within a data file users can *summarize* large volumes of data into more meaningful groups of transactions. Tools also allow the user to build business rules or fraud indicators to apply against transaction level data. Business rules are calculated fields where the user can interrogate and compare various data fields for specific conditions and can be later extracted into a separate data file for more in-depth analysis. Another powerful capability of data analysis tools is the ability to compare separate data files. Data mining is a

more sophisticated discipline within forensic audit that allows for complex data analysis tasks such as neural network, classification, clustering, and visualization.

Building a forensic audit capability can be thought of on two levels – building an organization-wide forensic capability as well as a more specialized forensic unit. An organization should strive to develop a base level of forensic capability for all auditors and investigators where any team can readily perform data analyses, such as, summarization, file joins, and trend analyses with transaction level data within and between data files as part of an audit or investigation. This requires training on the use of data analysis tools and more importantly to use them on a consistent basis in performing the work. The general approach for performing forensic audit is not dramatically different than a traditional audit approach. Teams develop audit objectives, identify the audit universe, map out the process under review, identify key control points, develop the audit program, collect and test evidence, report the results. The National Science Foundation Office of Inspector General began building a forensic audit capability during 2010 and has made great progress in surfacing issues in its external awardee oversight work that would not have been possible with traditional audit techniques. Examples include unallowable cost transfers, costs claimed after awards have expired, and use of award funds for operational expenses.

Friday, June 24

Theme 3: Using Technology for Fraud Prevention and Detection

Technology for Plagiarism

James T. Kroll, Head of Administrative Investigations, Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, United States

This presentation provides a historical overview of plagiarism and research misconduct (RM) investigations at National Science Foundation/Office of Inspector General (NSF/OIG) as well as presents information on technology our office has used to investigate allegations of plagiarism. We review the definition of RM which NSF uses, provide information on the increasing trends in RM cases we are observing, and present a few case studies. Next we provide an overview of the various software packages that are available for detecting plagiarism and provide an in-depth discussion about the capabilities of the iThenticate software and the methodology our office uses to analyze documents where plagiarism is suspected.

PLUTO (Advanced data search)

Charles MacMillan, External Auditor, EC, DG INFSO

One of the hallmarks of project funding through some of the EC programmes is the need for multiple project participants, oftentimes from differing Member States. In addition, participation from small and medium enterprises is encouraged. At the time of audit, the gathering of reliable data can be difficult. In response to this challenge, the EC developed its own advanced data searching system drawing upon its existing database of research participants and commercially available software products. With this system, auditors are able to extract valuable information from their own IT systems and still comply with complex data protection laws.

This approach has been very effective in findings and investigating irregularities in research grants. In addition, it complements other approaches in the audit selection and data gathering phases.

Suspension and Debarment as a Tool for Combating Fraud, Waste, and Abuse

Allison Lerner, Inspector General, National Science Foundation, United States

The Inspector General at the National Science Foundation presented an overview of the suspension and debarment process, administrative remedies that federal agencies may take in order to protect taxpayer dollars from fraud, waste, abuse, poor performance, and noncompliance with contract provisions or applicable law. Debarment ensures that for a defined period of time, the entire federal government will not do additional business with individuals and organizations that are not “presently responsible: i.e., those that have engaged in criminal or other improper conduct of such a compelling and serious nature that it would lead one to question their honesty, ethics, or competence. Causes for debarment include criminal conviction and violations of the terms of a contract/grant. Suspension *immediately* prohibits a persons from participating in covered transactions for a temporary period of time. Adequate evidence and immediate need to protect the government are required for a suspension.

The Inspector General described a case study of a large-company suspension in which a contractor was suspended amidst allegations that the company improperly received contracts intended for small businesses.

GENERAL WORKSHOP OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Workshop participants are grateful for the efforts of Marc Bellens, Sabine Gruener, and Anne Verriest of the European Commission in Belgium for providing the venue and general support for this meeting. Also special thanks to Mary Pully, Susan Carnohan, and others for their assistance in coordinating the logistical and organizational arrangements for this year’s workshop.

The tenth annual Accountability Workshop will return to France, the site of our first Workshop, and is scheduled for **June, 2012** to be co-hosted by the French National Research Agency (ANR).

For additional information, contact Mary Pully, email: mpully@nsf.gov or Kristen Cutforth, email kcutfort@nsf.gov at the National Science Foundation, USA.

**International Workshop on Accountability in Science and Research Funding
European Commission
Directorate-General for Research & Innovation
Brussels, Belgium**

22 – 24 June 2011

AGENDA

Co-Chairs: Marc Bellens, Head of Unit "External Audits"
European Commission, Directorate-General for Research & Innovation
European Union

Co-Chairs: Allison Lerner, Inspector General
Brett Baker, Assistant Inspector General for Audit
Kristen Cutforth, Assistant Counsel to the Inspector General
National Science Foundation (NSF)
United States of America

Themes:

- 1) Striking the proper balance between accountability / sound financial management and the need for simplification;
- 2) Identifying and managing fraud risk from the perspective of a research funding organization; and
- 3) Using technology for fraud prevention and detection

**Venue: European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
(CDMA building, rue Champ de Mars 21, 1050 Brussels – room
SDR1/2)**

Tuesday, 21 June 2011

6:30 –8:00 PM “Meet & Greet” Reception hosted by the European Commission, Restaurant "29", room "Boudouin", rue de la Science 29 (entrance rue de la Science 27)

Wednesday, 22 June 2011

Theme 1: Balancing accountability / sound financial management and the need for simplification

8:30 AM Workshop Registration

9:00 AM Welcome and Introductions – **Franco Biscontin**, Director Management Operational Support – Framework Programme, Directorate-General for Research & Innovation

9:15 AM **Mark Bellens (Co-Host)**

9:45 AM **Gareth MacDonald**, Head of Assurance, Research Councils UK: Balancing Accountability and Simplification

10:45 AM Break

- 11:00 AM **Martha Rubenstein**, Chief Financial Officer, National Science Foundation, USA: Research Funding at the NSF
- 11:45 AM Lunch break
- 1:00 PM **Edwin Croonen**, Head of Unit Internal Audit, EC, DG RTD: Balancing Accountability and Simplification
- 1:45 PM Break
- 2:00 PM **Ian Carter**, Director of Research and Enterprise, University of Sussex, UK: Balancing Accountability and Simplification
- 2:45 PM **Thomas Sinkjaer**, Director, The Danish National Research Foundation, Denmark: Balancing Accountability and Simplification
- 3:30 PM Close for the Day
- 6:30 PM Guided tour at the **Museum Magritte**, Place Royale 3, 1000 Brussels
- 8:00 PM Dinner hosted by the European Commission at the Museum Restaurant, Place Royale 3, 1000 Brussels

Thursday, 23 June 2011

Theme 1: Balancing accountability / sound financial management and the need for simplification

- 9:00 AM **Michel Griffon**, Science Advisor, Office of the Director General, National Research Agency, France: ISO 9001 Certification at ANR
- 9:45 AM **Patrick Vincent**, Director of Finance & Human Resources, Okinawa Institute of Science & Technology, Japan: Use of Management Technologies at the Newly Established Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology (OIST) to Meet its Multiple Accountability Requirements
- 10:30 AM Break
- 10:45 AM **Andrea Balla**, Head of Department, Social Sciences and Humanities Committee, Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, Hungary: The Financial Aspects of Supporting Basic Research at HSRF
- 11:30 AM **Lynne Chronister**, Assistant Vice Provost for Research and Director of Sponsored Programs, University of Washington, USA: Process Improvements at the UW
- 12:15 PM Lunch break

Theme 2: Identifying and Managing Fraud Risk

- 1:00 PM **Trine Tengbom**, Director, Internal Audit, The Research Council of Norway & **Heidi Eriksen**, Adviser, Internal Audit, The Research Council of Norway, Norway: RCN Fraud Case Study
- 2:00 PM **Maurizio Dal Toso**, External Auditor, EC, DG Research & Innovation: Presentation of a case
- 2:45 PM Break
- 3:00 PM **Brett Baker**, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, USA: Framework for Audit Oversight
- 4:00 PM Close for the Day
- 4:30 –6:00 PM Guided Tour of the **European Parliament**

Friday, 24 June 2011**Theme 3: Using Technology for Fraud Prevention and Detection**

- 9:00 AM **James T. Kroll**, Head of Administrative Investigations, Office of Inspector General, National Science Foundation, USA: Technology for Plagiarism Detection
- 10:00 AM **Charles MacMillan**, External Auditor, EC, DG INFSO: PLUTO (Advanced data search)
- 10:45 AM Break
- 11:00 AM **Allison Lerner**, Inspector General, National Science Foundation, USA: Suspension and Debarment as a Tool for Combating Fraud, Waste, and Abuse
- 12:00 PM **Kristen Cutforth**, Wrap-up Discussion (Brainstorm topics and issues for future Workshops) / Conclude Workshop
- 12:30 PM Adjournment

PLEASE NOTE: All sessions will be conducted in English.

Revised: 11-03-11

2011 ACCOUNTABILITY WORKSHOP

June 22-24, 2011- Brussels, Belgium

PARTICIPANT LIST

COUNTRY**Denmark**

Mogens Klostergaard Jensen
Deputy Director
Danish National Research Foundation
Holbergsgade 14, 1
1057 Copenhagen K
Denmark
Phone: +45 33181954
FAX: +45 3315 0626
mkj@dg.dk

Assistant: C. Hansen, Secretary dg@dg.dk

Mr. Thomas Sinkjaer
Director
Danish National Research Foundation
Holbergsgade 14, 1
1057 Copenhagen K
Denmark
Tel: +45 3318 1950
FAX: +45 3315 0626
dg@dg.dk Alternate: ts@dg.dk

**European
Commission**

Marc Bellens
Head of Unit - External Audits
European Commission
Directorate-General for Research & Innovation
Square de Meeus 8, B-1050
Brussels, Belgium
Phone: +32. 2 .295. 09.42
Fax: +32.2. 296.10.94
Marc.bellens@ec.europa.eu

Edwin Croonen
Head of Unit - Internal Audit
European Commission
Directorate-General for Research & Innovation
Square de Meeus, 8, B-1049
Brussels
Belgium
Phone: +32.2.296.18.67
Fax: +32.2.299.83.66
Edwin.croonen@ec.europa.eu

APPENDIX B

Sabine Gruener
Administrator - External Audits
European Commission
Directorate-General for Research & Innovation
Square de Meeus 8
B-1049 Brussels
Belgium
Phone: +32.2.296.06.87
Fax: +32.2.296.10.94
Sabine.gruener@ec.europa.eu

Charles MacMillan
External Auditor – External Audits
European Commission
DG Information Society and Media
Beaulieu 25
B-1049 Brussels
Phone: +32.2.298.88.85
Charles.Macmillan@ec.europa.eu

Maurizio Dal Toso
External Auditor – External Audits
European Commission
DG Research & Innovation
Square de Meeus 8
B-1049 Brussels
Phone: +32.2.298.67.84
Fax: +32.2.296.10.94
Maurizio.Dal-Toso@ec.europa.eu

Serge Vanacker
Competitive Contract Manager
European Commission -Joint Research Centre
Via E. Fermi, 2749
I-21027 Ispra (VA)
ITALY
Phone: (+39) 0332/78.53.84
Fax: (++39) 0332/78.64.65
Serge.VANACKER@ec.europa.eu

Philippe Coenjaarts
Head of Unit – Implementation of audit certification and
outsourced audits
European Commission
Square de Meeus 8, B-1049
Brussels, Belgium
Philippe.coenjaarts@ec.europa.eu

France

Philippe Freyssinet
Deputy Director General
French Research Agency (ANR)
Agence Nationale de la Recherche
212 rue de Bercy
cedex75012 Paris
France
Phone: 33 (0)1 78 09 80 40
Philippe.freyssinet@agencerecherche.fr

Michel Griffon
Science Advisor
Office of the Director General
National Research Agency (ANR)
212 rue de Bercy F-75012 Paris
France
Phone: 33 (0)1 78 09 80 30
Michel.griffon@agencerecherche.fr

Germany

Florian Habel
Head of Auditing Section
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)
German Research Foundation
Kennedyallee 40
53175 Bonn
Germany
Phone: +49 228 885 2609
Fax: +49 228 885 3010
Florian.Habel@dfg.de

Beate Wilhelm (Dr.)
Head of Management Accounting Audits
Department of Economics & Auditing
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) Kennedyallee 40
53175 Bonn
Germany
Phone: +49 (0) 228 885 2228
Fax: +49(0) 228 885 2599
Beate.wilhelm@dfg.de

Holland
(The Netherlands)

Meine Bosma
CFO Chief Financial Manager
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts & Sciences
Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (KNAW)
PO Box 19121
1000 GC
Amsterdam NL
Mobile: 0611014313
Phone: +31 (0) 20-5510790
Fax: +31(0) 20-6278426
meine.bosma@bureau.knaw.nl

Hungary

Andrea Balla
Head of Department (Social Sciences & Humanities)
Hungarian Scientific Research Fund
H-1093 Budapest, CZUCXOR STR. NR. 10
Hungary
Phone: (36-1) 219 8725
Fax: (36-1) 219 8756
Ballandrea@otka.hu

Ireland

Donal Keane
Chief Operations Officer
Science Foundation Ireland (SFI)
Wilton Park House, Wilton Place
Dublin 2, Ireland
Phone: 00353-1-607-3248
Fax: 00353-1-607-3201
donal.keane@sfi.ie

Jeremy Twomey
Head of Audit & Compliance
Science Foundation of Ireland (SFI)
Wilton Park House, Wilton Place
Dublin 2, D2
Republic of Ireland
Phone: 00353 1 607 3202
Fax: 00353-1-607-3201
Jeremy.Twomey@sfi.ie

Japan

Patrick Vincent
Director of Finance & Human Resources
Okinawa Institute of Science & Technology
1919-1 Tancha, Onna-son
Kunigami-gun,
Okinawa, 904-0412
Japan
Tel (mobile): +81 (0)80 2703 7226
Fax: +81 (0)98 966 2152
patrick.vincent@oist.jp

Norway

Trine Tengbom
Director
The Research Council of Norway (RCN)
P.O. Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen
N-0131 Oslo
Norway
Phone: 0047 926 59 284
tte@rcn.no

Heidi Eriksen
Senior Adviser – Internal Audit
The Research Council of Norway (RCN)
Stensberggata 26
PO Box 2700 St. Hanshaugen
NO-0131 Oslo
Norway
Phone: (+47) 22 03 72 38
heer@rcn.no

Spain

Angel Montes-Garcia
Jefe de servicio de control y seguimiento
Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovacion
Secretaria de Estado
Albacete, 5
Madrid
E-28071
Spain
Phone: ++34 916037012
Fax: ++34 916037014
Angel.montes@micinn.es

Switzerland

Sandra Scheidegger Schori
Head of Controlling
Swiss National Science Foundation
Wildhainweg 3
3001 Bern
Switzerland
Phone: +41(0) 31 308 22 48
sschori@snf.ch

United Kingdom

Ian Carter (Dr.)
Director of Research and Enterprise
University of Sussex
Falmer
Brighton, BN1 9RH
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 1273 877718
Fax: +44 1273 678192
i.carter@sussex.ac.uk

Gareth MacDonald
Head of Assurance, Research Councils
Biotechnology & Biological Sciences Research (BBSRC)
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon, SN2 1UH
United Kingdom
Phone: +44 (0)1793 413 222
Fax: +44 (0)1793 413 201
Gareth.MacDonald@bbsrc.ac.uk

**United
States**

Brett Baker
Assistant Inspector General for Audit
Office of Inspector General
National Science Foundation, Suite II-705
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: 703-292-2985
FAX: 703-292-9158
bmbaker@nsf.gov

Lynne Chronister
Assistant Vice Provost for Research
UW Box #359472
University of Washington
4333 Brooklyn Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98195-9472
Tel: 206-685-7065
lchronis@u.washington.edu
lchronis@uw.edu

Kristen Cutforth
Deputy Counsel to Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1135
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: 303-312-7615 (Denver Office)
Fax: 703-292-9158
kcutfort@nsf.gov

James T. Kroll
Head of Administrative Investigations
Office of Inspector General
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite II-705
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: 703-292-5012
FAX: 703-292-9158
jkroll@nsf.gov

Allison Lerner
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1135
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: 703-292-7100
alerner@nsf.gov

Alternate contact: Mary Pully mpully@nsf.gov

APPENDIX B

Martha A. Rubenstein (Marty)
Director/Chief Financial Officer
Office of Budget, Finance & Award Management (BFA) Suite
405
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: 703-292-8200
Fax : 703-292-9255
mrubenst@nsf.gov

Final 11-3-2011