January 25, 2010

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING SUBCOMMITTEE

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

- FDP A-133 Audit Website Update
- http://nrc59.nas.edu/a133/fdp_a133_menu.cfm
- Entered/certified data from 50 institutions

Responses from Schools	2006	2007	2008	2009	Total
Count of Questioned Costs	1	2			3
Count of Compliance Findings	1	4	1		6
Count of Systemic Findings	2	11	6		19
Count of Organization	5	19	25	1	50

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

- Website – Feedback on Usefulness
- What's working?
  - ease of use, workable reports, timeliness
- What's not working?
  - Dual entry with FAC, separate FDP registration, incomplete data (too few schools)
- Website versus FAC – pros and cons
  - Solutions for moving the pilot forward

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

- Risk Assessment is a major role in effective subrecipient monitoring
- Tools and templates
  - What works and what doesn't?
    - Various models and templates
    - Uniqueness of each institution's risk requirements (sometimes dictated by the state, or by Internal Audit)
    - Duplicative requests for each subaward, rather than a single annual request for each subawardee

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

- Considerations moving forward
  - Need for "Profile" Data
    - Subrecipient monitoring – audit results
    - Subrecipient monitoring – risk assessment data
    - Subawards – contacts and basic institutional information
    - ARRA subaward reporting – standardized fields
  - FDP "Profile" Page?
  - Better integration/overlap of Subawards and Subrecipient Monitoring (and ARRA) subcommittees?

SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

× Other considerations?