



Request for Approval under the “Generic Clearance for the Collection of Routine Customer Feedback” (OMB Control Number: 3135-0130)

IDI Questions for Grants Management System (GMS) Provider

Cover Letter for all interviews include the following disclosure:

Information is being collected to assess the feasibility of creating an online system (the “Portal”) to report Final Descriptive Report (FDR) data to the NEA and NASAA and to study ways to make the process of FDR reporting more streamlined, robust and timely.

The information will be used to assess whether such an online system is feasible, and if so, to recommend potential options and specifications for such a system.

For the people whom we contact, we estimate the time required would be a total of ninety (90) minutes. IF will supply a list of questions prior to the call so interviewees can familiarize themselves with the topics, requiring around thirty minutes. The questions would then serve as guidelines for a phone interview that would last about 1 hour.

Participation is voluntary. We do believe there is a benefit for the participating interviewees and their organizations. The Portal, if implemented, should make reporting FDR data simpler, faster and with fewer errors. Also, the system might have additional features that would facilitate the sharing of information internally as well as with the public once implemented.

The information provided in each interview will be shared with the NEA and NASAA.

IF will likely perform a follow up with an online survey about 30 days after initial contact. About 60 – 90 days after the initial contact, we will share the findings of the feasibility study and present the concept for the online system through a web seminar or similar method. All of the interviewees will be invited to participate and give feedback, although it is not required.

No sensitive information is being requested.

OMB No. 3135-0130
Expires 4/30/2014

Grants Management System (GMS) Provider Interviews

IDI Questions for GMS Providers

1. The NEA and NASAA are studying ways to improve the FDR reporting process. The concept presently under consideration is an online "Portal" to allow state and regional art agencies (SAAs/RAOs) to submit the data into a web-based system instead of sending the information through e-mail as an attached file or through mail copied onto a physical disk.
 - a. SAAs/RAOs would be given an account on the Portal whereby they could sign-in and upload the data file presently (e-) mailed to the NEA and NASAA.
 - b. The Portal would perform certain minimum data validation checks and flag potential errors found in the data. SAAs/RAOs would be able to review and change the data as appropriate. They would also be able to view the data in certain standard tabular formats.
 - c. Possibly, some data visualization options, such as mapping and bar charts, could be available, if the data met certain validation thresholds.
 - d. After having a chance to review your data through the standardized checks, tables and charts/maps, an appropriately authorized user from the SAAs/RAOs would be able to submit the dataset to the NEA and NASAA by clicking a button.
 - e. NASAA and the NEA would then further review the data according to their own procedures and requirements.

Additional features for the Portal could be incorporated either initially or over time, but as a minimum configuration, what do you think of such a system? How could it best impact the arts field? How could it be made to work with your GMS system? What would be your concerns?

2. Please describe broadly the technology solutions you offer your clients and how that expertise is more specifically applied to private and public arts organizations?
3. Please describe the products offered to public art agencies. Please describe the data architecture behind each of them.
4. What technology stack (e.g., Microsoft; Linux-Apache-MySQL-PHP) do you develop your technology on? Could you give us a sense of why you chose that technology stack?
5. How varied are the products, or the version of the products, currently in use in the field by public arts agencies?
6. Please describe the recent evolution (last 2 - 4 years) of your products used by



arts organizations. Please describe the development cycle that drove those changes. How did you collect and integrate customer feedback to drive those changes?

7. How do reporting requirements (Federal, State, or other) figure into driving new features?
8. What would your concerns be around building enhanced links from the GMS to a Portal for purposes of FDR reporting.
9. Which areas within the GMS do customers seem to be most at ease with? Where do they seem to encounter the most difficulty?
10. Are there levels of security/privacy within the GMS? Please demonstrate this functionality. Have SAAs/RAOs had problems with this?
11. What's the typical training required by customers to get up and running? What's the typical ongoing support extended to customers?
12. What are typical support questions that your customers bring up?
13. Which reporting or data visualization features are most used or are popular with your clients? Are there plans to expand these features, and if so, how?
14. To what extent are your products interoperable with other arts data sources, such as the CDP, or to demographic or socio-economic data?
15. Is there an important category of information that your clients are not typically collecting but could easily be collecting?
16. [Bromelkamp Only]: In the FDR reminder memo that goes out to the state and regional agencies every year, NASAA offers to assist Pearl users to export FDR data from the Pearl GMS, or to estimate their needs to set up Pearl to export the data. Could you describe the necessary steps within Pearl to set it up for automatic export, and could you describe the typical process for state agencies to do this.

