An Interview with

MARY SANTONASTASSO

OH 471

Conducted by Jeffrey R. Yost

on

27 July 2011

National Science Foundation

Charles Babbage Institute
Center for the History of Information Technology
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Copyright, Charles Babbage Institute

Mary Santonastasso Interview

27 July 2011

Oral History 471

Abstract

With support from the National Science Foundation (Grant No. 0811988, "Designing and Using FastLane: Distilling Lessons for Cyberinfrastructures") CBI researchers Jeffrey Yost and Thomas Misa conducted oral history interviews with 70 NSF staff members as well as numerous additional interviews during 29 university site visits. An overview of the project is available at <www.cbi.umn.edu/oh/fastlane/> and a complete set of 643 publicly available interviews is at <dx.doi.org/10.13020/D6RG6B>. Here on the CBI oral history database is a selection of notable NSF staff including Joseph F. Burt, Jean Feldman, C. Suzanne Iacono, Constance McLindon, Carolyn L. Miller, Paul Morris, Andrea T. Norris, Erika Rissi, Craig Robinson, Mary F. Santonastasso, Rich Schneider, Frank P. Scioli, Beverly Sherman, George Strawn, and Frederic J. Wendling. Topics common to many of the interviews include the design and development of the NSF's FastLane computer system, interactions with users, e-government initiatives, grants management practices, peer review, and NSF policies and practices. These interviews span a wide range of NSF staff, from program officers to senior managers.

Mary Santonastasso headed the Division of Institution and Award Support and provides high-level description of awards, policy, and finance at NSF.

Yost: My name is Jeffrey Yost from the University of Minnesota and I'm here today on July 27, 2011 at the National Science Foundation with Mary Santonastasso. Can you begin by briefly giving me some information on what your educational background is, what your work experience was prior to coming to NSF?

Santonastasso: Sure. So let me start; my name is Mary Santonastasso; I'm currently the Director of the Division of Institution and Award Support, which is in the Chief Financial Officer's office at the National Science Foundation. My division has three components, primarily, in addition to the front office, which are the Policy Office for the Foundation; the Awards Systems Branch, we're the custodians of the internal system that's used to obligate the Foundation's funding; and the Cost Analysis and Audit Resolution Branch, which not only oversees those two key functions but is the lead for post-award monitoring and oversight on the whole portfolio of NSF's awards. Prior to coming to the Foundation I was the Director of the State and Local Assistance Division/BJA for the Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Justice, which was the largest grants-making arm of the Department of Justice. My undergraduate education is from the Catholic University; my graduate education is from Princeton University. I've been at NSF for the last 10 years.

Yost: Can you briefly describe what your initial reaction was to learning that there was this FastLane system?

Santonastasso: Well, my background at the Justice Department fostered me to expect to have an electronic system to manage grants.

Yost: They have one?

Santonastasso: …they did have one there; and in fact, when, because of my position, I managed $2.5 billion of program funds; so I was a division program director there and had the preponderance of the funding that went through, [went through] my bureau, in my division. And because we had some very large programs that came to us in the mid-90s; we had developed first a fairly immature system that then went on to be a web-based system. It was when I came to NSF that I was aware of FastLane and the history around it being groundbreaking; first a research project and then something that was taken in as the infrastructure for the foundation. I found it very impressive because of the proposal load that it was able to handle. I was also aware that very few other federal agencies really had anything that was that robust. So it was interesting for me, when I was actually first interviewed for the position that I came in -- I was previously the Division Director for Grants and Agreements here – when being interviewed, I was asked about well, what is this paperless system you now have at Justice? I think people there were surprised that there was another agency that had been doing that kind of development. Definitely FastLane was a pioneering, groundbreaking system. I think, by all accounts -- and now with my 10 years of experience behind me, as well as all the interagency work that I do -- it's clear that the foundation really was on the forefront of bringing information technology and applying it to what was before, a sequential paper-based process. So, I

mean, it's impressive, and I think what's even more powerful about it is where it's [positioned] the foundation for leadership in grant award processing involving government.

Yost: Do you recall when the Department of Justice system was implemented?

Santonastasso: It began in the mid- to late '90s, and it just progressed thereafter. Some of the first forays were around some of the block grant programs; local offers a block grant program, which I was the director of; things of that nature. They were at first immature technologies, as I said, and then we were able to, over time, move them to a web-based environment. So now it's a pretty mature technology that really does all of the external kinds of intake, all the way to the internal processing.

Yost: And when you came to NSF, one of the chief responsibilities was to manage this at NSF?

Santonastasso: Well, not initially. Initially, I was the Director of Grants and Agreements. So that's the business side of the house, which is very different for me because I was used to working on the program side of the house; much like Program Officers here. So what my Grants Officers; at the time that I came here in 2001; it was before E-jacket; in fact, though the intake from FastLane was automated, internally there was a system but there was still paper that came down, in terms of jackets, for the Grants Officers to deal with. So while we did intake electronically, there were still things that were printed out, put

into hard copy grant files, that then came down to the Division of Grants and Agreements. The Grants and Agreements officers were literally moving between an electronic awards system and paper. So we, I think, as is common in these kinds of efforts, the foundation focused on the external community needs first; I think very smartly looked at what their needs were because we serve the community; we're an agency whose mission is only carried out to the extent that we can push grant funding out, right? So you want to make that easier for your community; get their input about what would be the most helpful; and then we eventually grew the rest of the system to be able to come in and make work easier for internal staff. So people hear FastLane in the community, my surprise when I came in was recognizing that FastLane was really 40-plus applications or modules, when you looked at it internally. I think that's not uncommon, it's just the way it's described as just if it's this one, end-to-end system that was not modularly built, which of course it was. It was, you know, you built something, you piloted it, you tested it, you kind of made it better, and then you would deploy. And we continued that, I think, successfully as we've moved into other areas.

Yost: So E-jacket had not been launched yet, but it was something that was under discussion at NSF when you came?

Santonastasso: Not that I'm aware of. I think Andrea Norris was the first person. Actually, she and I came within six weeks of each other and because of our relative positions within NSF CFO and CIO's office, we partner a lot of different initiatives because it's really important to have business and IT folks working together. But Andrea

really started EJ as a pathfinder, and that's what it's really meant to be. How can we now

take all the internal paper that we've got and, not just get rid of paper, but actually

improve the process because again, you go from sequential, paper-based kind of

processing to information technology, which really allows parallel processing in so many

different tracks. It's very dynamic.

Yost: Can you talk about any role the Division of Grants and Awards had with providing

guidance or advice on what functionality, what type of organization E-jacket would

have?

Santonastasso: Sure. So when you look at the Division of Grants and Agreements,

because they're the grants officers who are responsible for actually obligating the

foundation; they obligate the funding for NSF and on behalf of the Federal Government.

They're very important to this whole process because Program Officers recommend

funding; their Division Directors concur with that; but we don't have a grant agreement

in place until the Grants Officers actually sign it. So in the Division of Grants and

Agreements at the time, before we went through a realignment, and now in my current

role in DIAS, we have; because we are responsible for policy, as the place where the NSF

grants Policy Office resides. And we have the IT responsibility for the awards system, the

custodians of that system. We had a lot of input into the kinds of documentation that

would be required to be maintained in the electronic system that would be EJ. So it was

really important that wherever there were compliance checks that could be applied

automatically, and captured, and documented; that the business rule be in place, that they

be consistent with the NSF grants policy. So it would be things like the Program Officer is looking for the certifications for an IRB or an IACUC; other kinds of those approvals. Those are predicate to our making an award. Well if those certifications are a piece that needs to be captured, they need to be able to file the documentation in the system; they need to be readily available for the grants officer to look at. The same holds true for budget information. So we actually were able to look at the documentation that needed to be available; at what level it needed to be available; how long it needed to be maintained; what sequence, etc. prior to obligation of funds. So from that perspective, my folks work on all systems that have to do with grants management for NSF, but we're heavily engaged in all of the early business design, business requirement development for the E-jacket system. The same thing when there's any kind of an audit finding, where an auditor looks and says hmm, what are you doing here with annual reports? Do you get them? What's the timing? How do you report them? Those kind of post-grant requirements, we'll look at those, assess them and work with the Division of Information Systems to get those implemented technologically effectively. So set out business process requirements; we of course liaison with program to make sure that from their user perspective, the needs that they have, that those are captured; and then together we work with DIS because they're the technical implementers of all of these. I think Andrea [Norris] would be the first to say that a technologist shouldn't the ones making those decisions. They can bring technology, but technology has to do what the user and the business process owner really wants and needs it to do.

Yost: Right. To what extent was paper documentation the model in trying to decide what features and attributes the electronic system would have versus, well, we might be able to document things in ways that look very different from paper in an electronic system?

Santonastasso: I think that evolved over time. At least my recollection is that initially, that things -- and still, I think, if you go into the awards system, which is a very old client server system, still – if you look in that it still looks a lot like some of the paper forms. So you would see that initial reaction is always oh, here's the paper; let's somehow "electronify" it. Over time, what I've seen evolve here, and just at the government-wide level, this whole notion of no, we have data that we need to capture. It's important to understand what data we need at different parts of the process; and oh by the way, as early on in the process as we can capture that data and then have it follow through the business process; you capture once and use many different times. So in FastLane, E-jacket, any of our development, I think in the more immature stages paper would drive, because it's what you had to begin with. And then – when you're using the system – and you get smarter, and you think oh, wow, I can capture all the data early on, it's data capture, and why can't I get this here? This practice yields a number of positive results: it streamlines the process; it allows you to be more efficient at a time when our proposal level continues to go up and our staffing does not. And I believe also, from where I sit with my oversight hat on, the more that we can have accurate data capture early on, the better we are at carrying out our stewardship roles throughout the proposal and grant management life cycle. We have a stewardship role in the review process, the pre-award, the awarding process, but then post-award monitoring and oversight relies on that data as

well, to be effective as good government stewards. So I know it's a long answer, but I think it's sort of typical that you have paper first and then go oh wow! I can do this a little bit better as the tools get better; as you get smarter about how to use them.

Yost: Are there any federal government standards as to what electronic documentation, and crating an electronic audit trail would look like? Have any standards been set or were other systems looked to in providing advice to DIS on what the E-jacket needed to accomplish?

Santonastasso: That's a good question. Of course, there are a number of groups; even that we've worked with at the government level that have set standards out for applications and intake. So you have the regular government Standard Form (SF) 424 that was the standard form for applying for federal assistance. NSF never used that form; there was a whole research and related data set used for proposal submission. So that was on the application end. But when you looked at the Federal Demonstration Partnership, they had an ERA group, who got together and looked at the various standards that needed to be in place in that regard. In terms of from an audit perspective; I don't know how to answer your question in terms of the data standard, per se; but there is documentation that would be required for any of our forms to be complete and auditable for the auditor. So you want to be sure that you can document the approvals, the electronic signatures, for instance; the internal control segregation kinds of things. And so it's really important to be able to capture all of those. And, of course, we always have to deal with NARA [National Archives and Records Administration], and whether or not; what

documentation they'll accept, and is required for federal records retention standards. NARA first accepted the documentation for our declined proposals; they later focused on the types of IT data that would be acceptable for fulfilled awards. These discussions were in process when I began at NSF, and six, seven years later we were still in negotiations with NARA over that. What that meant, though, was that we continued to work here to improve the system. The declines represent 70 percent-plus of our work load anyway. Our success rate, because of the proposal load that we get in, is under 25 percent. So if you get the declinations archived, you're getting a lot. And now they'll accept the whole file. Was that helpful?

Yost: Yes, very much so. And can you remind me what year you moved to DIAS and what your job title was?

Santonastasso: So I'm the Division Director for DIAS – Division of Institution and Award Support; initially, I was the Director of the Division of Grants and Agreements; we went through a major organizational realignment here in the CFO's office, primarily to strengthen our posture in terms of oversight. And because stewardship is such a big conversation nationally -- private sector, public sector, Federal Government transparency, etc. – so, in looking at the realignment it was determined that it would make sense to combine our policy function with our awards system function and then with our post-award monitoring and oversight activities. I had 20-some years of experience in grants before I came here, and had designed risk-based models for oversight. We implemented a risk-based model for a post-award monitoring here in the Foundation. So that's really

how I came to take over this position; so it was really with that focus on post-award monitoring oversight, and having the understanding of the need to do data mining and data analysis, in order to set up risk-based models for oversight. So at any given time the Foundation has about $18 - $20 billion of active awards; 40-plus thousand award numbers; how do you determine which of those do you need to look at in any given year to have assurance that you're doing a good job for oversight. So I was asked to put together a model for that and we've developed and matured that over time.

Yost: And it's at that point that you started also working on interagency?

Santonastasso: I probably started working on the interagency things even before that. So shortly after I came into NSF, maybe in 2002, there was a Grants Executive Board that had been formed to give oversight to the Grants.gov initiative. The then Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, was designated by OMB to lead the initiative, with HHS as the overall lead agency. HHS put a solicitation out to all the other agencies for board members, and I was appointed as the NSF representative. This was due to my role as Director of DGA, and in addition, I had experience with state and local grant programs as well. I understood how those grants worked; all the requirements there; and then had the research background from NSF. And had the policy office in my organization and the responsibility for obligating awards.. So since that time, I worked on the interagency kinds of activities. Subsequently, OMB put together a number of lines of business and they brought technology to those. The executive sponsor out of OMB for those was the E-gov office. The then-administrator, Karen Evans,

specifically asked if I would lead the Grants Management Line of Business; NSF would be the agency managing partner and I would serve as lead on behalf of NSF. I worked with Karen previously at the Department of Justice, so she knew me, but she also knew what my position was here. And so since that time I've lead that initiative on behalf of the Federal Government with NSF as the agency managing partner.

Yost: How would you characterize the view that the other agencies had in the early 2000's regarding FastLane? At that time many of them had developed their own systems.

Santonastasso: Sure. So agencies always look at NSF as a leader. And many agencies, not only in the U.S. but other countries benchmark us. Andrea Norris and I jointly have done outreach with agencies; they've come to us and asked to benchmark us. We have worked with OMB when they've wanted to learn more about our system; and we've also worked with other countries; most recently, China. We've implemented an exchange with China; at their request. So we've been there twice; and they've been here; they want to keep alternating that. Other agencies continue to look at us as a model; because FastLane remains a pathfinder, and was really a standard for others to look at. I think the research community also, I think, played a huge role in that because as users, they talked about what a great system it was and they wished other agencies would just adopt it. We hear that routinely. I think we've held the leadership position for a variety of reasons. We've been put in this leadership position in the government level so we've been able to, you know, either through my voice, through the voice of the staff here who serve on – my whole division serves on a lot of interagency committees, as does Andrea's – we are great

proponents, I think, and ambassadors for the Foundation of FastLane because we know how important it has been to our success. I think in recent times, Research.gov is the new enterprise architecture and hopefully we'll be able to keep up that same level of service and reputation. That's our view and desire, of course, for the Foundation. We're still seen as a standard.

Yost: Was there any discussion of FastLane as becoming the standard?

Santonastasso: Sure.

Yost: Did a not-invented-here mentality come into play at other agencies?

Santonastasso: A little bit. And so, you know, it depends on where you're sitting and who you're talking to, right? We serve as "ambassadors" for our agencies; if you were to leave, you'd be the ambassador for whatever agency you go to. And you know, that makes a lot of sense for a lot of reasons. We also integrate prior experiences into successive jobs Earlier you asked about my professional background; I neglected to note that my education includes public policy. Public administration is really my field, so as a public administrator, you know, it's about what I'm doing for an organization wherever I sit. And so my colleagues in other agencies, I believe, feel the same way. I don't believe the perspective is "the not-invented-here syndrome" but about supporting fully the mission of the agency. FastLane was tuned very tightly for NSF business requirements. Those of us at NSF who have worked in the interagency community are proponents for

the FastLane system, rather than going to something more generic. We know it fully

supports our mission work. And what would meet the unique needs of the research

community; the kinds of information that we need to make on behalf of the federal

government; very different than what you'd need for a formula or block grant program

that's going to a state. It's not better; it's not worse; it's just different. And if you've not

had both hats on you don't have full appreciation of that. So, you know, some of my own

colleagues here who have only worked in NSF, oftentimes will; you know, we talked

about it and we are proponents and talk about FastLane relative to other systems and

realize that those systems are just fine for what they're doing for those agencies. Having

worked in one of those other agencies, I can say that with assurance. I can also say to

those folks, you know what, what you have wouldn't work for us. And so it's important

to have those discussions because when you get up to the government-wide level and

you've got budget cutters looking, they haven't always worked in at the agency-level, so

they may believe that one standard [is] okay for everyone. . You can take a standard to

the highest level, and you can build a system to the highest level standard; you miss a lot

of information that then is really needed to do due diligence for the public, for taxpayers,

for our oversight officials. So, it's always a balance; so I don't think it comes from a bad

place, a –"not-invented-here" mindset; it comes from, the parochial but also very

legitimate needs that I think folks have. Everyone wants their agency or wherever they

work to be looked at as the standard, right? It's a point of pride. Thank goodness; we

want good prideful service.

Yost: So were you involved from the beginning stages in interagency work and planning with Grants.gov?

Santonastasso: Probably it would be considered the fairly early stages, yes. So the co-managing partner, or the managing partner at the time was Charles Havecost and he was the first person who chaired that initial 11-member grants executive board. So I was in there. Now, HHS really had done a lot of the planning itself and we were sort of, I think, put on more of a political imprimatur; like okay, that looks fine. I always knew from early on that Grants.gov did not meet the NSF needs because the Grants.gov only takes in – or at that time, particularly – took in applications built on the SF424, which wasn't something that NSF used; a standard form for federal financial assistance. It does not collect that additional information that we needed to do our merit review process. So Grants.gov was, useful for agencies that had not had an automated way to receive applications.   It was conceived of, described, sketched out on paper in simple diagrams, as the post office, basically, so instead of sending your proposal in to; or applications, as you call them in other agencies – into a variety of other agencies – you would send it in to one place and it would shoot it to the various agencies. So it was pretty rudimentary technology.

Yost: So was it pretty much looking for the basic common ground, that all the other agencies could use, and recognizing that it couldn't serve all the functionality probably for any of them?

Santonastasso: Right. The closer you get to mission delivery, the more specific the requirements are. If you keep the requirements close to proposal intake; and then I believe at the back end, if you look at things closer to the payment of the award, you can keep things fairly generic. It's when you take that grants management functionality inside that things, I think, get a little more tailored, for a variety of reasons. Mission; you know, research mission versus safety mission, versus housing mission; information's different.

Yost: What are the biggest challenges that had to be overcome in producing Grants.gov?

Santonastasso: HHS as the managing partner was going to be reliant on the system and among the heaviest users. There was funding. There's technical oversight, contract oversight, all being in one place; but the funding was reliant on agency contributions. There was not always agreement, on requirements, the appropriate funding levels. Every agency comes to the table with its own interests. You have to bring your "big hat" to the table if you're looking at government-wide kinds of things. Most people come with their little hat, as well, and you need to do that because you can't trade away things delightfully that would negatively impact the ability of your agency to still deliver its mission. So I think those are the key things.

Yost: I know with FastLane there was a committee, an external committee that provided advice that was composed of PIs and SRO staff in the research community. Was there a mechanism for a similar type of advice from the research community in developing Grants.gov?

Santonastasso: There were a number of communities for Grants.gov, it was not just research focus, obviously, because of the mission of Grants.gov. So they had stakeholders groups, there's the ERA committee that's out of FDP; we have Jean Feldman -- who is in my division, who's the head of the Policy Office here – led the research and related subcommittee. So there were a variety of different ways that the research community could have input. Big driver for Grants.gov, though, had to be – because it's a government-wide system – it was looking dollars over transactions. So while research represents a lot of transactions, larger dollars are awarded in grants to the states in formula grants. It began with discretionary grant programs. and those dollars were big dollars for a lot of agencies. And you see how a big managing partner as HHS; that's the largest grants making agency for the federal government in terms of new dollars; so they had a big stake in it. So while we had a voice, it wasn't always the voice that carried; that was the loudest – it may have been the loudest – but we didn't always have the most weight when it came to decision making. Where NSF was most effective, was at making sure that we were never compelled to make our users solely use Grants.gov. I would either go to the table routinely and negotiate on behalf of NSF; and then did so with again being able to do it with my position as the head of a line of business. It was being sure that if you're going to force us to use Grants.gov as the only way to provide proposals in, then you better build it out a little bit differently. If not, we will make sure that it is an option for our community but we need to be able to maintain FastLane. That's a big win. And that still exists today because Grants.gov, even though it has matured, it suffers from some of the same problems of not stable funding, having to pass the hat among agencies;

you know, not being able to do technology refresh in a way that you would like, etc. etc. etc.; and we still maintain that optional submission, and FastLane is our intake. And we've been able to move them with Research.gov to do some experiments, in terms of being able to get an assistance system, is where we're going next, for a submission. Those were big deals, too, because the Office of Management and Budget was not allowing agencies to invest in new development. Operation, maintenance was fine; new development, not. So had we not been leaders at the table, that wasn't going to be; that we were going to be compelled to go to a lower standard for us. So we always made the case that because we were here, we built to a high; you know, we were earlier and we've got a higher standard. It doesn't make sense for you to take us to a lower standard, just for the sake of saying it's a government-wide initiative.

Yost: So you characterized that as a big win…

Santonastasso: I think it is.

Yost: Was it really difficult to achieve?

Santonastasso: It takes a lot of political acumen; it takes OMB looking at you and saying, you as an agency, you know you're a good agency, we know that you know what you're talking about, and you've got a track record, and it's proven; and help us in how we can move forward with the government-wide concept things and make those successful. So we've done that; we're really good executive branch players in that

initiative. So we take care of our research mission; that's first and foremost; we carry that mission out through grants; we have to make sure that everything that we have in terms of our systems are robust enough to allow us to do that. By doing so we are also supporting the administration be successful. But there are some agencies who haven't been as effective in conveying their message.

Yost: Am I correct in understanding that when the extra money came from the [ARRA] stimulus package that to be disseminated by NSF, or during that time period because of the added burden for Program Officers and NSF and for the program overall, that researchers were told, or could only submit, using FastLane?

Santonastasso: Wrong assumption though. It wasn't because Program Officers were overburdened. It had nothing to do with Program Officers. Yes, we were told; actually, we made the case through the Grants Executive Board that, one, Grants.gov would not be able to handle the load of all of the proposals that would be coming in government-wide through ERA; and so we made the case to the Controller, that said if you make us use Grants.gov as the sole technology, you – as in administration – will not be able to do for the President what's needed to be done because the technology is failing and we don't believe it's up to the load. What we need is for you to allow us to accept proposals in, only through FastLane. So it's a different underlying hypothesis there; and so it had to do the Grants.gov technology, not our Program Officer load, which was indeed heavy. And it was based on that, that Danny Werfel, the Controller, said those agencies who have an intake capability will be allowed to roll-off. And we did.

Yost: Has the internal system, E-jacket, also been a system that's been a model or has there been sharing on technology and practices between different agencies?

Santonastasso: Couple of agencies have looked at it. I'm not sure how much they've adopted it. Agencies are looking at how to use information technology more effectively and there continues to be a focus by the administration. So, yeah, we do conduct demonstrations of our E-jacket system. but I don't know how much it's really been adopted by other agencies, again, because it's tuned to NSF's unique needs as well. But we certainly demonstrate it for other agencies and, again, as I said earlier, internationally. We've had China, people from Hong Kong; United Kingdom; other countries come and just look at what we have.

Yost: And finally, are there topics I haven't covered, questions I haven't asked that you think are useful to understanding the history of FastLane, E-jacket, and management and administration regarding these systems at NSF?

Santonastasso: Sure. What I would say it; because as we've established, I'm not a technologist but I know from many years; and I have respect for what technology can do, as a manager, to make things more effective. I think what's important to appreciate about FastLane and E-jacket is that because we were ground-breaking, really putting on our research agency hat and think how can we use new techniques and technologies to manage this better? That's really postured us for, I think, success with Research.gov. And

Research.gov, I think, is going to be a really successful way of carrying on that tradition for the foundation, in terms of keeping us at the forefront; in terms of being able to use more configurable [technology]. And I think that's really important because FastLane wasn't really as configurable as we would like. So moving into an area where we're using much more configurable technology to be able to capture data and information, but use it in a multitude of ways so it's not the traditional way of sort of grants management life cycle but then taking data and really putting into different and new contexts so that it's real information. And I think being successful there will also help and sort of leverage up to the federal level. You see – I mentioned earlier, the focus on stewardship, technology, transparency – we know that our current President, as a senator, sponsored the Transparency Act. There's a lot of data being pushed out to government-wide websites for the public to see. I think that's much more than appropriate; it's so appropriate. But it raises questions when there's not context and you have to have data accuracy, validity, etc. and data without context isn't information. And so I'd like to see us really be leaders there and use new technologies that way, so I am hoping that that's something you might be able to look into and dig a little deeper in.

Yost: Yes, in the course of this project we've learned we have to definitely include the evolution to Research.gov.

Santonastasso: Good. Good, that's really exciting. Well, I've got a person on my staff that if you have time to ask, I would absolutely endorse your speaking to; it's Erika Rissi.

I don't know if she's on your list. And Erika is a Senior Staff Associate in my front office; and for me…

Yost: Can you spell her last name?

Santonastasso: Sure, it's R-I-S-S-I and it's Erika with a "k". But she is; it's mentioned that we partner with Andrea's staff [Andrea Norris] so a business process ownership partner with your technology specialist; Erika's the next level down in my office and so she has upped [?] our business office for Research.gov and as the business sponsors; she's got a little team who supports her and she works very routinely hand in glove with Andrea's technologist. So I'd endorse you talking to her about Research.gov. She'd be really excited about it, too; we have a lot of enthusiasm about this stuff.

Yost: Okay, well thank you so much.

Santonastasso: Thanks, Jeffrey. It's so nice to finally meet you.