Roundtable Discussion: Share your Vision for Lifespan Respite

Summary of Groups 1-3

Facilitator: Kevin Foley

Likes and Dislikes about ACL’s Past Lifespan Respite Funding Opportunity Announcement

- Limits set on percentage of funds that can be used for administrative costs are problematic, especially for Vouchers, which are time consuming. Allow for staff time to administer and do reporting. Collecting family focused data for evaluation also requires staff time.
  - **Response:** Limits are set by the state, not in federal statute

- Would prefer formula grant over competitive grant.
  - **Response:** Because of low funding levels, federal statute requires competitive grant process

- Need technical assistance on what can be used as in-kind.
  - **Response:** From 2016 Lifespan Respite Funding Opportunity Announcement - There are two types of match: 1) non-Federal cash and 2) non-Federal in-kind. In general, costs borne by the applicant and cash contributions of any and all third parties involved in the project, including sub-grantees, contractors and consultants, are considered matching funds. Examples of non-Federal cash match includes budgetary funds provided from the applicant agency’s budget for costs associated with the project. Generally, most contributions from sub-contractors or sub-grantees (third parties) will be non-Federal in-kind matching funds. Volunteer time and use of facilities to hold meetings or conduct project activities may be considered in-kind (third-party) donations. For more details, see Subpart C of 45 CFR Part 75 at [http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?node=pt45.1.75#se45.1.75_1306](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?node=pt45.1.75#se45.1.75_1306).

- Additional guidance and clarification are needed on Indirect Cost Rates and what can be used as match. The issue was raised regarding whether or not the state agency grantee is required to accept an approved Indirect Cost Rate from a vendor when contracting or can the grantee negotiate to accept a lower rate. There were examples of using the difference of an organization’s approved Indirect Cost Rate amount with a lower accepted rate as state in-kind match.
Suggestions for modifying future FOAs

- Pull in funding from different sources
- Streamline FOA
- Build in more flexibility
- Dedicate funds to provide opportunity to improve evaluation
- Better define Memorandum of Understanding and Memorandum of agreement so that they are not perceived of as formal contracts.
- Requirement that MOA with coalition be submitted with application needs to be changed. Some states are not permitted to enter into these type of agreements until money is awarded.
- Understand that state agency grantee has to be direct contact with the federal agency, but allow coalitions to also work directly with federal project officer.

FOA Positive Attributes

- Focus on evaluation
- Requirement for the development of a detailed work plan. Help with later strategic and sustainability planning
- Provides opportunity to develop a dreamscape to envision what is possible
- Ability to build on what has already been accomplished in the state.
- Letters of support are great as part of a large strategy to engage stakeholders
- Federal project officer’s responsiveness