

FY20254-20265 Assessment of Administrative Mechanism (AAM)

Scope of Work

Background:

Section 2602(b)(4)(E) requires Planning Councils to "assess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in rapidly allocating funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible area, and at the discretion of the Planning Council, assess the effectiveness, either directly or through contractual arrangements, of the services offered in meeting the identified needs."

The Planning Council assesses the efficiency of the administrative mechanism, which entails evaluation of how rapidly funds are allocated during the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program (RWHAP) Part A fiscal year from March 20254 to February 20265 (FY20254-265).

The purpose is to assure that RWHAP Part A funds are being contracted quickly and through an open process, and that providers are being paid in a timely manner. The Planning Council should not be involved in how the administrative agency monitors providers.

Generally, assessments are based on time-framed observations of procurement, expenditure, and reimbursement processes. For example, an evaluation could identify the percentage of funds obligated within a certain time period (e.g., 90 days) from the date of grant award. Similarly, reimbursement processes can be tracked from date of service delivery through invoicing to payment, with documentation of any adverse impact on clients or providers related to delayed payments. HIV/AIDS Bureau/Division of Services System (HAB/DSS) will occasionally request information about the assessment or require Eligible Metropolitan Areas (EMAs)/Transitional Grant Areas (TGAs) to submit a copy of the most recent administrative assessment as part of progress reports or grant applications.

In evaluating the administrative mechanism, communication between the RWHAP Part A Recipient and Planning Council is essential so that information can be efficiently shared. The Planning Council and the Recipient should establish, before the procurement process begins, a memorandum of understanding outlining a process and timeline for sharing data necessary to evaluate the administrative mechanism. The Planning Council must report back the results of its procurement process. The Planning Council may then assess the consistency of the procurement process with its stated service priorities and allocations.

If the Council finds that the existing mechanism is not working effectively, it is responsible for making formal recommendations for improvement and change.

The Planning Council can also assess whether the services that have been procured by the Recipient are consistent with stated Planning Council priorities, resource allocations, and instructions (directives) as to how to meet those priorities. However, assessing the administrative mechanism is not an evaluation of the Recipient or individual service providers, which is a Recipient responsibility.

Purpose of Conducting the FY20254-20265 Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism in the Orlando Service Area (OSA):

To answer the following questions:

1. What percentage of the RWHAP Part A 20254-265 grant award was obligated within 90-days of the Notice of Award (NoA)?
2. Did the RWHAP Part A Recipient follow the directives of the Planning Council in respect to the allocation of funds as stipulated by the Council for all categories of service?
3. Did the Procurement of services reflect the directives of the Planning Council?
4. Did the RWHAP Part A Recipient communicate back to the Planning Council the results of the procurement process within thirty (30) days after the process closed?
5. Was there timely execution of reimbursement to providers, if not; was there any adverse impact on consumers or providers related to the delay in payment?
6. Does the RWHAP Part A Recipient recommend the reallocation of funds to the Planning Council in a timely manner based on actual expenditures?
7. To what extent are the services that have been procured by the RWHAP Part A Recipient consistent with stated Planning Council priorities and Directives as to how to meet these priorities (ways to best meet needs)?
8. What specific improvements are noted in sub-recipient/Planning Council members' responses to their survey between FY 20243-254 and 20254-265?

Activities to be Conducted:

- A. Review and report on any improvements noted to recommendations identified on prior years Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism.
- B. Review existing survey tools used with the sub-recipients/Planning Council members to determine the tools effectiveness and present recommendations to the Service Systems Planning & Quality Committee (SSPQ) of the Planning Council of any suggested changes or improvements to the instrument.
- C. Conduct a Sub-recipient Survey using existing or revised tools to assess the perceptions of the sub-recipients regarding the procurement process.
- D. Conduct a survey of the Planning Council members to determine their perception of the procurement process.
- E. Conduct interviews with the County's fiscal staff in respect to the process and procedures associated with the reimbursement of invoices submitted by the RWHAP Sub-recipients.
- F. Conduct interviews with purchasing staff pertaining to procurement and the process for handling contracts and amendments.
- G. Evaluate files associated with invoices submitted by sub-recipients to determine timeframes from submission of invoices to reimbursement for services provided.
- H. Evaluate files associated with the issuance of contracts and amendments to determine timeframes with initiating and executing contracts and amendments.

The final report must include the following:

- A. Executive Summary.
- B. Methodology used by consultant.
- C. Planning Council Survey results; perceptions vs. findings based on research and objective analysis.
- D. Sub-recipient survey results; perceptions vs. findings based on research and objective analysis.
- E. Findings based on data collected on procurement, payment, and determination as to whether the Ways to Best Meet Need directive for RWHAP Part A has been followed.
- F. Contract and amendment findings.
- G. Sub-recipients' reimbursement findings.
- H. Evaluation on how the RWHAP Part A Recipient has handled Allocations, Reallocations and Expenditures
- I. Recommendations regarding process improvements of the Administrative Mechanism within the Orlando EMA.

Other Activities:

- Attendance at the Service Systems Planning & Quality Committee to review the Sub-recipient and Planning Council member surveys on or around March 124, 20265.
- One written draft report for the RWHAP Part A funding, presented to the Service Systems Planning & Quality Committee for review and comments on or around June 115, 20265.
- Final report presented to the Service Systems Planning & Quality Committee on or around July 940, 20265, the Executive Committee on or around July 167, 20265, and the Planning Council on or around July 2930, 20265.