U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, DC 20410-7000

GUIDE TO REVIEW PERFORMANCE REPORTS, COMMUNITY COMPASS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMS (CFDA NUMBER 14.259)

CONTENTS

Revision History

Table 1. Revision History

Revision Number	Revision Date	Summary of Changes	Author(s)
0	8/10/2021	Initial Performance Report Guide	Christine Brown David Larimer
1	11/3/2021	Updated the GTM/POTAC and GTR checklists to match DRGR Added reference to the GTR and GTM/POTAC performance review tracking tool	Christine Brown Braden Boyd
2	2/10/2022	Updated GTM due date for	Christine Brown

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals:

Table 2. Approvals

Name	Title
Stephanie Stone	Director, CPD's Technical Assistance Division

OVERVIEW

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) views this Guide to Review Performance Reports as a template for HUD staff to monitor progress and assess the performance of award recipients ("Recipients") and activities supported by HUD funding. This Guide applies to awards issued to applicants for the Community Compass Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Program, which includes all funding sources associated with CFDA number 14.259 (collectively referred to as the "TA Program"). This Guide specifically discusses review periods, scope, and feedback to the Recipient.

HUD supports technical assistance (TA) efforts that develop and provide resources, tools, and support to Recipients of HUD funding -- state and local government grantees, public housing authorities, tribes and Continuums of Care, and nonprofit organizations – through the TA Program. The efforts build capacity and offer innovative strategies for cross-program efforts. Performance reports document if and how well the purpose is being fulfilled, and reports provide an opportunity to correct any issues.

Performance Reports – submitted quarterly and at the end of an award (e.g., Final Report) – are tools for Recipients to document and communicate expected scope compared to results of awards and work plans, including findings, outcomes, activities, methods, lessons learned, and products of significance to the fields of housing, community development, and community development and housing strategies. This also shows HUD that the Recipient has systematically tracked work plan implementation by highlighting the quantity, quality, and timeliness of work plan objectives, outputs, and outcomes.

HUD encourages Recipients to use Performance Reports as a tool to provide HUD with an understanding of successes and innovations of TA work – from inception to completion – as well as difficulties and challenges faced while giving an outlook for the future. The success of an award is not solely measured by whether the award and TA work achieved anticipated outcomes, but also on the lessons learned through TA work and how well they are articulated, to inform future activity. Further, reports are a tool for maximizing the use of reported results.

Reports are also an opportunity for HUD to offer input, assistance, and oversight on the technical assistance activities and awards. Performance Reports may inform HUD's decisions to continue with an existing award and/or future funding decisions.

AUTHORITIES

This Guide operationalizes the following authorities, which provide the context for this Guide and represent the authorities acknowledged with the signed cooperative agreements for the TA Program.

- 2 CFR 200.327 (1/1/2014 version) and 2 CFR 200.328 (8/13/2021 version), Financial reporting
- 2 CFR 200.328 (1/1/2014 version) and 2 CFR 200.329 (8/13/2021 version), Monitoring and reporting program performance
- TA Program Cooperative Agreement Provisions, sections:
    - o Monitoring and Reporting Requirements (2020-2021, 2018-2019)
    - o Financial and Program Performance Reports (2017, 2016, 2015, 2014)
    - o Reports (2008-2013)
- Data elements for OMB approval number 2506-0165 and OMB approval number 2506-0197
- Section VI.C.3 of the TA Program Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs)

REFERENCES
- Guide to Prepare Performance Reports
- DRGR User Manual

APPLICABILITY AND PURPOSE

This Guide applies to HUD's review of Performance Reports for any funds awarded under the TA Program, as well as any discretionary funds managed by HUD's Technical Assistance (TA) Division, which is within the Office of Community Planning and Development. Use of this Guide begins with the Performance Reports due October 30, 2021. This Guide replaces previously issued performance guidance.

The review of Performance Reports is primarily assigned to HUD Government Technical Representatives (GTRs), Government Technical Monitors (GTMs), and Program Office Technical Assistance Coordinators (POTACs), under the direction of HUD's TA Division and the Cooperative Agreement Officers (CAOs).

HUD ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

HUD GTMs or POTACs assume the following activities related to the review of Performance Reports:

- Provide input on the proposed design, implementation, and tracking of work plan progress, from an outcomes perspective

- Help with format and content on the Performance Report, and help Recipients to understand how the Report data will be used by HUD

- Provide regular technical advice and assistance with the deliverables and outcomes of a work plan, and tracking to the outcomes and purpose of the assigned TA

- Recommend acceptance or rejection of Performance Reports to the GTR

- Offer feedback and direction on TA work to help Recipients meet work plan outcomes, and outcomes of TA assignments

HUD GTRs assume the following activities related to the review of Performance Reports:

- Provide input on the proposed design, implementation, and tracking of work plan progress, from an award compliance perspective

- Help with format and content on the Performance Report, and help Recipients to understand how the Report data will be used by HUD

- Provide regular technical advice and assistance on the overall work plan terms, eligibility of activities (proposed or actual), and tracking to the outcomes and purpose of the cooperative agreement

- Collaborate with GTMs and POTACs to accept or reject Performance Reports, and accurately document HUD's review

- Offer feedback and direction on TA work to help Recipients meet work plan outcomes and outcomes of the TA Program and cooperative agreement

Cooperative Agreement Officers (CAO) are responsible for using the Performance Reports and HUD's review of the Performance Reports, to judge award success, to support future funding for the TA

Program, and to report to Congress. CAOs may also use Performance Reports to inform any future awards with TA or with other agencies.

GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR PERFORMANCE REPORT REVIEW

Recipients complete and submit Performance Reports to HUD using the template available within HUD's Disaster Recovery Grant Reporting System (DRGR). The DRGR Performance Report template includes the following components. The Performance Report Content of this Guide expands on these components and HUD's review of Reports is centered around the same information.

1. Financial performance. In general, HUD is looking for a description of actual expenditures along with the SF 425 (Federal Financial Report) data elements.

2. Narrative on performance related to the implementation of TA, for the overall award and each work plan.

    a. Overall progress and significant developments for the award/all work plans and activities/tasks active for a 3-month period, using the Federal fiscal year calendar.

    b. Significant developments on work plans and activities/tasks.

3. Resolution or remediation comments for potential compliance issues as flagged in DRGR.

4. Optional attachments to support the Report. Attachments must not be used to capture the reporting requirements; the fields in DRGR must be used to capture reporting requirements.

The Recipients' narratives should contribute to understanding the progress made and significant accomplishments, difficulties and challenges faced, and lessons learned, while giving an outlook for the future. Within DRGR, award compliances issues are flagged for the Recipient to address with the Performance Report submission.

Both HUD GTMs/POTACs and GTRs are required to complete a review of each Performance Report, following receipt in DRGR. The reviews evaluate the Recipients' response to the components noted above, to assess the quantity, quality, and timeliness of work plan objectives and outputs and outcomes, and general management and administration. The review includes any follow-up recommendations and designates each Report as either acceptable or unacceptable. Recognizing that there may be reasonable variations depending on the TA work plan types and funding sources for an award, GTRs and GTMs should provide Recipients with direction, as needed, on content and format of Report submission in DRGR.

Tip: Recipients are strongly encouraged to complete the DRGR Performance Report template throughout the quarter; it is not recommended that Recipients wait until the end of the quarter to fill out the Report template in DRGR. This may be a valuable practice, especially for awards and work plans where HUD may benefit from more frequent updates on progress, to help shape work as it is occurring. Regular inputs can benefit Recipients, as regular updates alert HUD of any issues and successes and can streamline completing the Report after the quarter-end. Throughout the quarter, inputs in the Performance Report will also indicate to HUD that the Recipient may initiate a meeting to discuss the development, potential barriers, or need. HUD can view any data saved in the Performance Report in DRGR.

A. **Timely Performance Report Submission**

1. **Quarterly Performance Reports**. Performance Reports are due to HUD no later than 30 days after the end of each quarter, based on the Federal fiscal year. The due dates for each Reporting Period are listed below and in the cooperative agreements. Failure to submit a Report timely may be considered a material weakness in award management and may result in corrective action.

2. **Final Performance Reports**. For any award made *prior to* the 8/13/2021 revisions to 2 CFR, a final Performance Report is due no later than 90 days after the award ends or after funds are expended, whichever is first. For any award made *after* the 8/13/2021 revisions to 2 CFR, a final Performance Report is due no later than 120 days after the award ends or after funds are expended, whichever is first. The final Performance Report takes the place of the quarterly Performance Report at the end of the award's final year. For example, an award funded for three years will have 11 quarterly Performance Reports and one final Performance Report.

3. **Reporting Periods and Due Dates**. The following Federal fiscal year quarter periods must guide the timing of each quarterly and final Performance Report.

Table 3. Reporting Periods and Due Dates

Reporting Period	Due Date of Report	HUD GTR Completeness	HUD GTM/POTAC	HUD GTR
Quarter 1: 10/1 – 12/31	January 30	10 business days	March 1	March 15
Quarter 2: 1/1 – 3/31	April 30	10 business days	May 30	June 15
Quarter 3: 4/1 – 6/30	July 30	10 business days	August 30	September 15
Quarter 4: 7/1 – 9/30	October 30	10 business days	November 30*	December 15*
Final: varied	During the quarter that represents 90 days or 120 days from award end	10 business days following submission	30 days following submission	60 days following submission

PERFORMANCE REPORT ACCEPTANCE AND REVIEW

Use the direction in this section with the Appendix I - Review Checklist in this Guide, to complete a full review of Performance Reports. This checklist will be available with the review form in DRGR.

Additionally, this Review Checklist questions are available in the GTR-Performance Review Tracking Template, and the GTM-Performance Review Tracking Template. These templates are tools to record your response to checklist questions, and to track comments and corrective actions over time. These tools are available in the Performance Report training section of the Community Compass TA Resources SharePoint at https://hudgov.sharepoint.com/sites/OGrp-CommunityCompassTAResources. There is no requirement to use the templates; GTRs and GTMs/POTACs are required to use DRGR record checklist responses, comments, and corrective actions.

The GTR and GTM reviews are divide into two parts: a completeness review and a substative review .

A. Completeness Review

Upon receipt of each Performance Report, GTRs should note the timing of the submission. Then, GTRs should review the Performance Report for **completeness within the 10 business days** following submission of the Performance Report in DRGR, to the extent possible.

Note: Recipients are required to review and resolve or acknowledge/remediate DRGR flags – DRGR alerts of potential compliance issues – prior to submitting a performance report for HUD's review. HUD GTRs should review these flags for awareness of award performance and compliance. Note that having flags will not prevent the Recipient from submitting the Performance Report or performing any other functionality in DRGR. However, if active DRGR flags continue for multiple quarters, GTRs may consider rejecting the Performance Report.

B. Substantive Review

Both GTRs and GTMs/POTACs should complete **substantive reviews, generally, within 45 calendar days** following the Performance Report due date. However, an unofficial review of the Report and conversations with the Recipient regarding performance can begin as soon as the Recipient enters performance data into DRGR.

HUD GTRs and GTMs/POTACs may consult with other staff, including subject matter experts (SMEs), with knowledge of the Recipient's performance during the quarter. This Guide provides illustrative questions for the HUD GTRs and GTMs/POTACs to consider in completing performance reviews. This will help structure the review of the Performance Report in DRGR, and help structure follow-up conversations with the Recipient, measure progress against plan, detect deviations, and establish corrective action with the recipient.

HUD GTRs and GTMs/POTACs must concurrently review the Performance Report; however, reviews from GTMs/POTACs must be completed before the HUD GTRs review, so that the GTRs can consolidate feedback, formulate the HUD response (approved or rejected) with detailed comments, and document DRGR. GTRs and GTMs/POTACs should use Table 3. Reporting Periods and Due Dates to help guide the timing of substantive reviews.

1. Substantive Review – General Criteria

The substantive review should answer the following general questions:

- Is the Recipient implementing the work plan as approved?
- Was the Recipient successful in achieving the award purpose and approved work plan tasks, outputs, outcomes, and milestones?
- Did the Recipient face any obstacles that hindered it from achieving its goals, and if so, was the Recipient proactive and responsible in addressing the obstacles?
- Was the Recipient able to effectively plan and manage the award purpose and work plan outputs, objectives, and outcomes?

2. Substantive Review – Specific Criteria

Review and evaluate the entire Performance Review using the following criteria.

- Review the Performance Report and observe actual performance against the approved award purpose, work plan scope, personnel, tasks, budget, outputs, outcomes, and milestones. Note differences.
- Determine if the award, work plan, tasks, outputs, outcomes, and milestones are on time (on schedule).

- On the SF 425, confirm if the "Total Funds Drawn (10a Cash Receipts)" matches Total Funds Expended (10b Cash Disbursements). If not, confirm if the SF 425 comments address the root cause of the differences.
- If there are leveraged funds reported under Matching Funds, confirm that the narrative describes the source and what it was used for.
- Determine if the work plans are on budget (money spent). Consider the number of budget changes (for the quarter and to date).
- Determine if work plans are on time. Consider the number of time extensions (for the quarter and to date).
- Determine if the work plan is complete and work plans are marked as closed.
- Determine active flags – DRGR alerts of potential compliance issues – and the Recipient's resolution to each flag. Assess the root cause.
- Assess the root cause of any deviations, based on observations of actual against approved work plan specifics.
- Evaluate the effect of deviations on the award purpose and work plan tasks, outputs, outcomes, and milestones.
- Evaluate waste and inefficiency related to the award and work plan tasks, outputs, outcomes, and milestones.
- Evaluate if the Report includes surprises (is there anything the Recipient hasn't made you aware of).
- Determine corrective actions, considering: 1) the award purpose, 2) work plan tasks, outputs, and outcomes designed, and 3) effectiveness and efficiency of the planned mitigation that the Recipient described in the Performance Report.
- Corrective actions and comments on the Performance Report should highlight themes, issues, and successes that are award-wide as well as specific to one or more work plans.
- Document performance review findings and corrective actions and include any changes needed to the work plans or planned implementation of the work plan or work plan budget. Develop a follow-up plan to monitor corrective actions.
- Ensure the Recipient is aware of the results of the Performance Report review. Inform the Recipient of the deviation issues, the corrective actions, and their effect on the award and work plan. During regularly scheduled meetings with Recipients, GTRs should make sure the Recipient agrees and should allow for adjustments as needed.
- Make any adjustments to the Performance Report review based on input from the Recipient.
- Monitor corrective actions. Determine if additional meetings are needed beyond the regular quarterly meetings.

DECIDE APPROVAL AND PROVIDE FEEDBACK

A. Determine approval

In most instances, Performance Reports should be accepted, and feedback comments should be applied. GTRs should limit rejections of Reports. Rejections should be limited to errors, omissions, inconsistencies, and narratives not suited for the Performance Report. An example of an <u>error</u> might be reporting too many trainings offered during the quarter in the performance measure section. An <u>omission</u> could be neglecting to report on a task that had activity and was vouchered against. An <u>inconsistency</u> could be a narrative stating a different number of trainings completed than reported in the quantitative performance measure section. Since there are specific requirements for the work plan/task level narratives, a <u>narrative not suited</u> to the topic could be a narrative that has been copied and pasted verbatim in each of the 3 narrative sections. The HUD review period is included in Table 3. Reporting Periods and

Due Dates. If the GTR does reject the Performance Report, the Recipient should respond to the issues and resubmit the Report within 2 weeks of receiving the rejection through DRGR.

B. Constructive feedback
Since Performance Reports are a feedback opportunity, both GTRs and GTMs/POTACs should provide Performance Report feedback (positive and or negative), regardless of whether it is ultimately approved or rejected. Constructive feedback on performance related to a program and administration is the goal. Constructive negative feedback does not mean a Performance Report should be rejected but rather is an opportunity for HUD to communicate performance to change behavior for better results. Feedback should consider that Performance Reports become a part of the official award file and may inform additional monitoring reviews and future funding decisions, and may be available for public review.

Note: The performance feedback aspect of the Review should not be confused with the requirement for Recipients to report its progress. For example, if a Recipient is overbudget, has changed the work plan significantly without HUD approval, and deliverables are overdue, that is not a reason to reject a Performance Report if the Report is completed correctly and without errors, omissions, and inconsistencies. It is, however, an opportunity to document the performance with constructive feedback for remedy by the Recipient.

C. Standing Quarterly Meetings and Additional Meetings
Feedback should be discussed with the Recipient during regularly scheduled quarterly meetings. All GTRs are expected to initiate these standing meetings. Consider more frequent meetings, as necessary, to discuss and track corrective actions. Here are some considerations for regular meetings and communications for Performance Review:

1. Consider how frequently to convene Performance Report Review meetings and who should be included? Take notes during the meetings.
2. Set an agenda and circulate it. Use Appendix II in this Guide, to help set the agenda for meetings.
3. Plan to find and work through root causes of issues.

Tip: When planning quarterly discussions with the Recipient, GTRs should schedule them soon after a completed Performance Report review, so that the review is fresh. Timing regular/standing quarterly calls after a Performance Report review will also provide the most timely way to discuss performance and any needed course corrections for action before the next Report is due.

Note: There may be times when there are many work plans and issues to cover on a quarterly call with a Recipient. This may be the case on awards with many work plans, complex awards, or on awards with multiple projects (i.e. departmental awards). GTRs should prioritize the discussion to the most significant issues in advance of the meeting to address this. If there are too many issues for a single meeting, schedule follow-up meetings. Consider how to best divide the discussion into separate meetings. For example, if there are many issues for a specific project (i.e., CPD, Public Housing, or Housing), then hold a separate meeting for that project and group the others into the other meeting. Use Appendix II in this Guide, to help set the agenda for meetings.

Additional meetings. GTRs and GTMs should be thoughtful about the need for additional meetings, and nail down the purpose of meetings, in the context of the cooperative agreement requirements regarding HUD's substantial involvement, and the performance feedback and technical assistance that may be needed to support the outcomes of TA work. For additional guidance on when more frequent meetings may be needed, reference the *Program and Provider Coordination* resource within the Appendix III of this Guide.

QUARTERLY REPORT NOT SUBMITTED TIMELY

After the submission due date for a quarter has passed, GTRs must begin verifying if Recipients have submitted all the required Performance Reports (Active and Ready to Close). If Reports are not submitted, GTRs should reach out to the Recipient to discover the reason and determine whether TA is needed. If a Performance Report is late, this should be noted as a performance issue in the quarterly performance review calls with the Recipient.

APPENDIX I – PERFORMANCE REPORT REVIEW CHECKLIST

The topics and questions below help establish consistency in HUD's review of performance report. These topics and questions are also included in the DRGR Review Checklist. GTMs/POTACs and GTRs may also use the Review Tracking tool to help track performance review comments over time. GTMs/POTACs and GTRs can then transfer the review, comments from the tools into DRGR. These tools along training videos on how to use the tools are available within the Performance Report section of the Community Compass Technical Assistance Resources SharePoint site at https://hudgov.sharepoint.com/sites/OGrp-CommunityCompassTAResources. Further, HUD may also include this checklist in Chapter 17 of the Monitoring Guide for the TA Program.

HUD GTM/POTAC

- ☐ **TA work plan progress**
    - ☐ Is the work plan amount drawn at pace with the performance period and the accomplishments described? Consider the number of past budget and time amendments that have occurred.
    - ☐ Is the progress of the work plan explained, in terms of the approved scope? Are ineligible TA activities described? If so, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ Does the recipient appear to be on track to meet output deadlines? If not on track or challenges are reported or known, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ Does the recipient appear to be on track to meet outcomes? If not on track or challenges are reported or known, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ Does the recipient appear to be on track to meet objectives? If not on track or challenges are reported, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ Are the measures reported and to date at pace with the projected measures for the performance period? If not on track or challenges are reported or known, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ If any deliverables were finalized during the quarter, are they posted on the HUD Exchange or in DRGR?
    - ☐ Is HUD collaboration needed more than expected or not occurring as expected? If so, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ Was HUD previous feedback incorporated into the work plan implementation? If not, was a valid explanation provided? Offer corrective action, if any.
    - ☐ If applicable, does is the match/leveraged contributed for the quarter appropriateeligible and correlated to the work plan progress?

- ☐ **Other feedback**

HUD GTR

- ☐ **Complete and timely.**
    - ☐ Does the Overall Progress Narrative explain the progress of this award during the quarter? Progress should be explained in term of the award purpose (or projects associated to the awards).Is the progress of the award explained, in terms of each project/award purpose?
    - ☐ Is there a narrative response for each active work plan that was active during for the reporting period? If not, take note and return the Report.
    - ☐ Was the Report submitted on time?

- Have all previous Reports been submitted? If not, how many arewhat's missing? If reports were late without a justification, indicate such.
- How many previous reports were late? And how many previous reports were justifiably late?
- Are there omissions, errors, or inconsistencies? If so, take note and return the Report.
- Are there active or unacknowledged DRGR flags?
- Other comments?

- **Overall award performance-financial (SF-425 Review)**
  - Are Cash Receipts and Cash Disbursements different amounts? If yes, is there an explanation? If not, take note and return the Report.
  - If Cash Receipts and Cash Disbursements are different, is there an explanation? If no explanation for the difference, take note and return the Report. Confirm if recipient has a reporting error or is drawing funds in advance of working.
  - Is Does the amount drawn appear to be at pace with the performance period? Consider the number of past budget and time amendments that have occurred. Take note and determine why the draws are not at pace.

- **TA Work plan progress – consider GTM comments, as well as Report data.**
  - Is the work plan amount drawn at pace with the performance period and the accomplishments described? Consider the number of past budget and time amendments that have occurred.
  - Is the progress of the work plan explained, in terms of the approved scope? Are ineligible TA activities described? If so, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
  - If work plan is complete, is the status showin as complete?
  - Are the outputs, outcomes, objectives, and measures on track and consistent with approved work plans? Consider GTM comments.
  - If measures, outputs, and outcomes are not on track, is there an explanation of variances in Projected and Actuals?
  - Did the recipient obtain the appropriate prior approvals during the quarter? Compare work plan versions for the quarter, and compare the current work plan to the Report descriptions.
  - If any deliverables were finalized during the quarter, are they posted on the HUD Exchange or in DRGR? Consider GTM comments.
  - Is HUD collaboration needed more than expected or not occurring as expected? If so, offer feedback and corrective action, if any. Consider GTM comments. Offer corrective action, if any.
  - Was HUD feedback incorporated into the work plan implementation? If not, was a valid explanation provided? Consider GTM comments. Offer corrective action, if any.
  - Is program income reported for any activity? Or is there an appearance of program income, based on narrative descriptions?
  - If applicable, doesis the match/leveraged contribution ed for the quarter appropriateeligible? If not, take note and return the Report.This question applies to Distressed Cities only.
  - If applicable, does the match contributed correlate to the work plan progress? Consider the feedback from the GTM.

- **Administration and Coordination work plans**

- Are Is the work plan amount drawn at pacethe Administration and Coordination work plan amounts at pace with the performance period and the accomplishments described? Consider te number of past budget and time amendments that have occurred.
- Is the progress of the work plan explained, in terms of the approved scope? Are ineligible TA activities described? If so, offer feedback and corrective action, if any.
- Did the recipient obtain the appropriate prior approvals during the quarter? Compare work plan versions for the quarter, and compare the current work plan to the Report descriptions.

- **Other feedback**

APPENDIX II – SAMPLE PERFORMANCE REVIEW AGENDA

ACTION ITEM REVIEW

- Review short term action items from previous meeting

OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS

- Review major themes
- Focus on work that needs HUD prior approval/HUD collaboration, work that is not on track, grantees that need additional TA, and innovative TA delivery that can be replicated across other engagements

DISCUSS KEY ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Review key problem areas; timeliness, eligibility, or quality TA issues
- Outline any decisions that need to be made; resources that need to be adjusted
- HUD action needed or directed

NEXT STEPS

- Capture action items for short-term and long-term issues; what actions need be take through the next reporting cycle
- Assign accountability for items
- Document DRGR

APPENDIX III – PROVIDER-PROGRAM COORDINATION ON TA

Use this resource to help decide when additional meetings and technical assistance is needed, beyond standing quarterly performance meetings. This resource and a complimentary decision tree are hosted on the Community Compass TA Resources SharePoint site: https://hudgov.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/sites/OGrp-CommunityCompassTAResources/Shared%20Documents/DRGR%20Resources/Training/Performance/Provider%20Program%20Coordination.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=X3EhJt.

Table 4: Provider Program Coordination

	IF, →	THEN.
A	The **Recipient** seeks assistance with workplan or activity design or development,	The **Recipient** should initiate and host intermittent or regular meetings with the Program Office.
B	The **Recipient** seeks assistance with troubleshooting obstacles or seeks guidance on prioritization or direction of a	The **Recipient** should initiate and host intermittent or regular meetings with the Program Office.
C	The **Recipient** seeks to keep the Program Office informed of workplan progress without initiating a meeting,	The **Recipient** should regularly update DRGR throughout the quarter and *SAVE* the updates for Program Office review. Each quarter the Provider must *SUBMIT* a performance report.
	IF, →	THEN.
D	The **Program Office** seeks to offer input on the structure and content of a	The **Program Office** should initiate engagement with the Provider to collaborate.
E	The **Program Office** seeks to support workplan delivery by providing information or materials to the Provider,	The **Program Office** should initiate engagement with the Provider to share information or materials.
F	The **Program Office** seeks a unique update from the Provider regarding the progress of a workplan outside the quarterly reporting cycle, to ensure alignment with Program Office activity, and the Provider has not entered information into DRGR,	The **Program Office** may engage the Provider to determine workplan status and progress.[1]
G	The **Program Office** seeks regular updates from the Provider regarding the progress of a workplan outside the quarterly reporting cycle, and the Provider does not regularly update DRGR,	The **Program Office** should request TAD assess the circumstances for adoption of a specific reporting requirement. If TAD determines a specific condition is justified, TAD will notify the Provider and establish appropriate requirements.[2]

---

[1] TAD has defined substantial involvement to include "monitoring progress of the project." A unique progress check to ensure coordination of the workplan with other HUD activities is considered a component of substantial involvement that is separate and distinct from quarterly and final reporting of progress performance and accomplishments.

[2] HUD may issue specific reporting conditions when an analysis of risk shows that the recipient may not timely deliver the agreed upon products and services (2 CFR 200.206) or upon determination that timely performance is critical to achieving technical assistance program outcomes (2 CFR 200.329).

APPENDIX IV - REVIEW RESULTS

HUD will update to this section with how results translate to poor performance and level of associated risks.