

From: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2007 11:15 AM
To: 'Sargis, Robert A (ACF)'
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Bob, thanks. So that means that the current abstinence ICR burden estimate was overestimating the burden by about 8000 hours? If that's true, then that's okay. But I'd like ACF to explain in a big greater detail how they arrived at these estimates in future submissions of this ICR. I understand the time pressures involved in clearing this ICR, so I will let this go for now. I will provide approval for 18 months, which will enable ACF to test the "proof of concept" and get a better sense of which other ACF programs will be using the SF-PPR.

As for the burden, in ROCIS you should report the total ACF burden, which is 11432.

Please make this change in ROCIS and upload the revised supporting statement.

Thanks!

Karen

From: Sargis, Robert A (ACF) [mailto:robert.sargis@acf.hhs.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2007 11:05 AM
To: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Karen, Your interpretation of the annual average estimates is correct. Also, as you indicated non-ACF agencies are not intended to be part of this request.

The primary reason for the discrepancy with the Abstinence Education is the burden per response. Discrepancies in most cases result from difference in the assumptions about what constitutes burden and experience on the part of responders.

Please advise on responses for ROCIS that need to be made by the Dept.

Also, a non-material change was submitted for the GADS form (0970-0328) requesting a revised expiration date. Any word?

Thank you

From: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2007 6:30 PM
To: Sargis, Robert A (ACF)
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Thanks, Bob. I just want to clarify a few things in #12. Given the way this is written, this is how I would interpret the burden break down:

There are 6 ACF programs that currently use their own ICRs but will start using the SF-PPR. Altogether, these programs will impose 1388 burden hours when they start using the SF-PPR.

There are also other ACF programs that are likely to start using the SF-PPR, for whom pre-existing ICRs do not exist. Altogether, ACF estimates that these other ACF programs will impose 10043.83 burden hours when they start using the SF-PPR.

Therefore, altogether, ACF programs will impose 11432 burden hours altogether when the programs start using the SF-PPR.

Other agencies may also use the SF-PPR. They will impose an additional 5495.33 burden hours when they start using the SF-PPR, for a grand total of 16927.33 hours for ACF and non-ACF agencies.

Is this the correct reading?

Also, just one question about the burden hours associated with the FYSB abstinence Education Program. The ICR that was recently submitted and returned as improperly submitted listed a total burden of 8670. However, it is listed in this revised supporting statement as 239 burden hours. Why is there such a discrepancy? Thanks.

Karen

From: Sargis, Robert A (ACF) [mailto:robert.sargis@acf.hhs.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2007 5:49 PM
To: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Subject: FW: Performance Progress Report

Karen, I attached a revised supporting statement with the markup option. Based on this should we change the ICs in ROCIS?

From: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Sent: Friday, November 23, 2007 12:27 PM
To: Elizabeth C. Phillips; Hug, Carrie A.
Cc: Curtis, Michael (ACF); King, Diana (ACF); Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); Sargis, Robert A (ACF); Pridgen, Marguerite E.
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Bob, thanks for your voicemail this morning. I thought it would be a good idea to respond via email to everyone involved so that we're all on the same page.

My understanding is that ACF agrees to what I proposed in my 11/21 email below. That's great!

Bob, to repeat what we discussed on Wednesday, what I will need from ACF to complete this ICR transaction is the following:

1. revised burden hours to reflect only those hours imposed by ACF programs using the SF-PPR. The total revised burden hours should be **at least** the total of all burden hours currently accounted for in separate ACF ICRs; however, ACF can request additional burden hours to account for other ACF programs that may decide in the next few years to use the SF-PPR
2. a revised supporting statement that lists all the ACF programs that currently use separate ICRs and will be "folded in" under the SF-PPR collection. The list should include the program name, current OMB control number for the separate ICR currently in use, and burden estimates for each ICR (i.e. the Abstinence Education Grant Program ICR will be listed, along with it's OMB control number 0970-0271, and 7198 burden hours and 118 responses).
3. a revised supporting statement that lists the other federal agencies ACF anticipates will start using the SF-PPR. We understand that this list is not going to be exhaustive, but the list should include agencies like the AOA and VA that ACF can reasonably expect will use this form in the

near future (much as you've already done in the existing supporting statement). All you need to do is list the agencies: you don't need to account for their burdens.

Bob, I've opened ROCIS for amendment for you. Once you have revised the burden hours, can you (or Seleda) update the burden information?

Once you have revised the supporting statement, please send it to me via email with all changes marked as track changes. For now, please don't upload this into ROCIS just yet.

I'll be gone until Thursday. It would be great if you could have all these changes made by the time I return so that I can start the clearance process for this ICR immediately upon my return and finish by the end of the month.

Thanks.

Karen

From: Matsuoka, Karen Y.
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2007 11:46 AM
To: 'Elizabeth C. Phillips'; Hug, Carrie A.
Cc: Curtis, Michael (ACF); King, Diana (ACF); Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); Sargis, Robert A (ACF); Pridgen, Marguerite E.
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Thanks, Beth. I've asked around in OIRA and I think I understand the situation now. When Marguerite sent you her email of 7/19/07, ROCIS was scheduled to be upgraded to accept SF forms as a unique entity. Unfortunately, the contractors/programmers are behind schedule and do not plan to have this up and ready until May 2008 at the earliest.

OIRA understands ACF's concern about assuming the burden for everyone in the federal government using the SF form. Still, we need a way to accurately account for the burdens government-wide until the new ROCIS feature is live. So here is what I would propose in the meantime.

1. ACF will include, in the burden accounting for the SF-PPR submission, ONLY those burdens that will be incurred ONLY by ACF programs who use the SF-PPR. (i.e, instead of the 10,000 some hours requested now, the burden will be for only ACF). However, the supporting statement should still list the other agencies ACF anticipates will choose to adopt the SF-PPR in the near future (i.e. you don't have to account for their burdens, but you should still list them and their programs).
2. All other agencies will need to submit their own ICRs to begin using the SF-PPR. If agencies already have pre-existing forms that will be replaced by the SF-PPR, they will need to submit ICR-revisions. If agencies do not have pre-existing forms, they will need to submit new ICRs. ACF should not let other agencies use the SF-PPR until they have received separate OMB approval to do so.
3. In May 2008 (or whenever ROCIS has the capability to process SF ICRs), ACF will submit a revision request so that this ICR is in the system as an SF form rather than a "regular" ICR.
4. Regarding the Abstinence Education Grant Program ICR that is currently here (0970-0271) and is requesting to use SF-PPR-D, this ICR will be withdrawn from the system. ACF should include the 7198 burden hours and 118 responses for this ICR into its overall burden estimate for the SF-PPR collection.

Is ACF amenable to this?

I will be away next week until Thursday and I understand ACF needs this approved by the end of the month in order to meet a statutory deadline. Can you send me a response no later than noon on Friday, the 23rd?

Thanks.

Karen

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth C. Phillips [mailto:ElizabethP@smdi.com]
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2007 5:21 PM
To: Matsuoka, Karen Y.; Hug, Carrie A.
Cc: Curtis, Michael (ACF); King, Diana (ACF); Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); Sargis, Robert A (ACF)
Subject: FW: Performance Progress Report

Here is the email. The OIRA staff that Marguerite worked with are "cc" to her July 19 message...Adam Newman, Alex Hunt, and Nicole Cafarella.

Beth Phillips

-----Original Message-----

From: Pridgen, Marguerite E. [mailto:Marguerite_E._Pridgen@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2007 5:15 PM
To: Curtis, Michael (ACF)
Cc: Paul Hasz; Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); Elizabeth C. Phillips; Michael.Nelson@noaa.gov; King, Diana (ACF); Newman, Adam B.; Hunt, Alexander T.; Cafarella, Nicole M.
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Michael-

The issues you cited below have been resolved. OIRA has confirmed that the sponsoring agency does not have to seek out response number estimates from each agency that might want to use the PPR. ACF as the sponsoring agency will submit the PPR to ROCIS under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) procedures and will provide an estimate of the respondent burden for the PPR. When other agencies want to use the PPR, they will submit estimates of the number of responses to the PPR they expect for their use of the PPR. The overall burden estimate per PPR respondent should not change based on the agency. If your PRA contact has any questions about submitting to ROCIS, s/he may contact the help desk or Mike Johnson at 202-395-7894.

Mike Nelson's workgroup will continue to manage the comment resolution and requirement collection processes for the PPR unless another group is designated by the Grants Policy Committee to do so. Mike has already set up a special email address for receiving public comments for the TPPR and the RPPR, which are being hosted by GSA.

I would like for ACF to host the PPR as a standard form. This means that the general public, not just ACF partners, should be invited to be part of the review and comment process before the format gets approved.

I've attached a FR notice that OIRA sent me as an example of how this can be done. I am sending this as an example in the event ACF does not have its own template for this type of notice.

Let me know how soon ACF will initiate the process to standardize the PPR. If you feel a conference call or a meeting is needed, please let me know. My calendar is open most of tomorrow and next week.

Thanks,
Marguerite
395-7844

-----Original Message-----

From: Curtis, Michael (ACF) [mailto:michael.curtis@acf.hhs.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2007 11:28 AM
To: Pridgen, Marguerite E.
Cc: Hasz, Paul (ACF); Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); elizabethP@smdi.com; Michael.Nelson@noaa.gov; King, Diana (ACF)
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Hi Marguerite,

Diana and I have the public service gene and want to make sure this excellent forms work succeeds. We could clear the form as a standard 4040-xxx form. To make this actionable, there are two key issues that we need to resolve.

1. Since this is a format and not a form, each agency would need to clear its unique burden hours directly with OMB.
2. A committee would need to continue to exist to collect requirements and make voted on recommendations to the CoE on how to change the forms.

Michael

-----Original Message-----

From: King, Diana (ACF)
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2007 10:21 AM
To: Pridgen, Marguerite E.
Cc: Curtis, Michael (ACF); Hasz, Paul (ACF); Dionne, Jeanne (ACF); Beth Phillips (elizabethP@smdi.com); Mike Nelson (Michael.Nelson@noaa.gov)
Subject: RE: Performance Progress Report

Hi Marguerite,

I may try to give you a quick call this morning on my cell phone to discuss. I may not have much cell phone coverage between this afternoon and Monday noon, but will be back within range after that. I am copying Michael Curtis, Paul Hasz and Jeanne Dionne since they are very involved in this and can facilitate answers to questions when I am away. I am also contract Beth Phillips since she is under contract with the Grants Center of Excellence (CoE) and has been working closely with Bob Sargis, our ACF forms clearance officer. I'm also, of course, copying Mike Nelson since he has been so instrumental in all of this process.

To answer your questions:

As soon as we have final OMB clearance on the SF-PPR forms, we are prepared to begin electronic pilots of the performance reporting forms with some of the ACF program offices and with our Grants Center of Excellence (CoE) partners. Since we are clearing these forms on behalf of the PL 106-107 workgroups, we would very much like to get them cleared with the OMB 4040-xxx clearance number that has been used to identify Government-wide standard grant forms such as those on Grants.gov. If you have any way to help facilitate that through OMB, we would greatly appreciate your assistance.

Since this is a technology implementation, we are considering this to be an electronic pilot and we are interested in working with agencies who may not yet have partnered with a consortia lead to pilot on their behalf as well. Those options could be either for them to use the blank, empty forms or to work with us to develop some web services interfaces to their back office systems as well for pre-population and validation of those forms. Since this may involve some cost to us and our contractors, there may need to be some level of technical support cost structure put in place to support agencies that have not partnered with us or another consortia lead, but this might not have to involve full partnership and migration and usage of all of our other grants management system services. We are open to conversations in this regard, and OMB leadership and support will be greatly appreciated.

We are considering this to be a pilot since the policy recommendation related to the streamlined Federal grant forms developed through the PL 106-107 workgroups is still in draft and has not undergone clearance or approval.

The other important aspect to note related to the SF-PPR forms and formats is that in many cases they are "formats" and can readily be used to apply those formats to existing agency performance progress reporting collections that already have OMB-clearance. The clearance and collection of burden hours remains the responsibility of the awarding agency for cases where program-specific or agency-specific information is to be collected using the SF-PPR formats in the electronic pilot.

I believe that ACF may, indeed, be interested in hosting this form on behalf of other agencies as a standard form, but Michael Curtis will be the one to help answer this question in conjunction with Curt Coy as our ACF Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration and with agreement for Terry Hurst, the HHS Deputy Assistant Secretary for Grants.

Diana King
Office of Information Services
HHS Administration for Children & Families
Cell 240-593-2479

-----Original Message-----

From: Pridgen, Marguerite E. [mailto:Marguerite_E._Pridgen@omb.eop.gov]
Sent: Wed 7/18/2007 7:01 PM
To: King, Diana (ACF)
Subject: Performance Progress Report

Hi Diana -

I wanted to know more about how ACF plans to issue the final PPR format . I have a few questions at this point and some suggestions we can talk more about when you return:

- (1) Are ACF's "partners" only the agencies that are using ACF's IT solution?
- (2) Would ACF be willing to own/host this form as a standard government-wide form? (If so, we can work with you in getting this done.)
- (3) Will ACF assign a Grants.gov form number to it (e.g., 4040-xxx)?

Marguerite

(202) 395-7844 voice

(202) 395-3952 fax