



Questions for the Record

Protecting American Innovation: The Federal Research Security Enterprise

7/15/2026

Representative Dan Newhouse –WA-04

Witness – Dr. Patricia Valdez, NIH

1. Universities such as Washington State University—which have campuses in my district—have invested substantial time and resources to comply with NSPM-33, CHIPS and Science Act requirements, research security training mandates, foreign influence disclosures, cybersecurity requirements, and talent recruitment program restrictions. What additional actions is your agency planning to mandate, and what specific measures does Congress need to implement that your agency cannot on its own?

NIH Response

NIH's current focus is on effective implementation of existing research security requirements, including disclosure, training, and institutional oversight. As we gain experience with these



requirements, we will continue to assess whether additional policy changes are needed.

On July 28, 2026, after the date of the hearing, the Administration released the [U.S. Government Policy for Stopping High-Risk Life Sciences Research](#).¹ Not only does this policy prohibit dangerous gain-of-function research, but it also prohibits NIH funding of life sciences research involving entities of concern, *i.e.*, research conducted outside the United States by an institution of concern or an individual of concern. The policy instructs the Director of National Intelligence, Secretary of State, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a list of entities of concern for the purposes of this policy. NIH will implement these prohibitions as required by the policy.

2. At the national level, it is my understanding that NIH had issued roughly 8,647 fewer awards than the FY21-FY24 average as of July 4, representing a 21 percent decline in awards and a 13 percent decline in obligated funding. This has impacted many universities, including Washington State University in my district, as they currently await hundreds of pending federal

¹ [whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/USG-Policy-for-Stopping-High-Risk-Life-Sciences-Research_July-2026.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/USG-Policy-for-Stopping-High-Risk-Life-Sciences-Research_July-2026.pdf)



proposals. To what extent are these institutions experiencing delays because of research security reviews compared to workforce constraints, policy transitions, or other factors?

NIH Response

Overall award timing is influenced by multiple operational and administrative factors. Funding data are updated monthly on our website [NIH RePORTER](https://reporter.nih.gov/).² The current data demonstrate that more awards have been made, and more funds have been obligated, this year compared to the same time period last fiscal year (FY25). NIH staff are working very hard to process awards as efficiently as possible while maintaining appropriate oversight.

3. Universities have spent considerable resources implementing new federal disclosure and research security requirements. Has NIH assessed whether certain institutions meeting enhanced compliance standards could benefit from more streamlined review and award processing?

NIH Response

NIH is continually evaluating opportunities to improve the efficiency of its award processes while maintaining strong

² reporter.nih.gov/



stewardship of taxpayer resources. Institutions with mature compliance programs and complete, accurate disclosures can help facilitate efficient review, and NIH will continue assessing process improvements that strengthen both research security and administrative efficiency. As explained above, research security reviews are not impacting the rate of award.