



Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council (GCERC)

Grants System Acquisition *Analysis of Alternatives*

April 20, 2018



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Management of grants is central to the work of the RESTORE Council. The RESTORE Act established a Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund to receive 80 percent of the civil and administrative Clean Water Act penalties resulting from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. A portion of those funds will be managed by the Council as federal assistance to support the restoration goals of the Comprehensive Plan. To achieve those goals the Council requires a robust grants management tool to facilitate performance of assistance objectives and to ensure compliance with federal assistance regulations.

The Council's current grants management system – the Restoration Application and Award Management System (RAAMS) – is built on a platform that will soon be terminated by the commercial vendor that owns it. The exact timeframe for termination is uncertain, but service would not continue beyond the remaining two option years the Council has on the contract. It is imperative to quickly identify a replacement for the grants management system and to initiate the work of implementing and transitioning to that system.

This Analysis of Alternatives, and the recommendation contained herein, is the work of the Council System Acquisition Task Force (Task Force). The Task Force was stood up by the Steering Committee for the purpose of investigating and recommending a replacement grants management system. The Task Force includes staff level representatives from state and federal Council members and members of the Council professional staff. The Task Force utilized publicly available documentation, subject matter experts at other federal agencies, targeted interviews and system demonstrations to gather information and conduct this analysis.

After careful consideration of the baseline requirements and desired features of a Council grants management system and evaluating available alternatives for functionality, cost, and comparative risk, the Task Force recommends that the Steering Committee select GrantSolutions. GrantSolutions is a federal shared service owned and operated by the Department of Health and Human Services and is available to the Council by way of an Interagency Agreement. It is the consensus opinion of the Task Force that GrantSolutions offers the best combination of functionality and cost and will mitigate the most risk to this central line of Council business.



REVISION SUMMARY

Version	Updated by:	Date	Changes Made
1.0	Joshua Easton	15-March-2018	Initial Draft
1.1	Joshua Easton	9-April-2018	Revision
1.2	Joshua Easton	17-April-2018	Revision
1.3	Jeremy Roseboom	18-April-2018	Revision
1.4	Joshua Easton	20-April-2018	FINAL



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION.....	4
PURPOSE	4
BACKGROUND AND RESTORE ACT ALIGNMENT	4
SELECTION METHODOLOGY	5
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	5
PROCUREMENT TASK FORCE	5
APPROACH OF THE TASK FORCE	6
SUMMARY OF INITIAL INVESTIGATION	7
FIRST STEPS	7
ELIMINATION OF COTS OPTIONS	8
MOVING FORWARD WITH THE FINAL ANALYSIS	8
ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES	9
CONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENTS AND FEATURES	10
COMPARISON OF COSTS	11
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.....	13
RECOMMENDATION	15



INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION

PURPOSE

This document is an analysis and business case for the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council's (the "Council") to select a replacement grants management system. The ultimate purpose is to provide the Council Steering Committee with a recommendation for procurement.

BACKGROUND AND RESTORE ACT ALIGNMENT

The Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act (RESTORE Act) established the RESTORE Council.¹ The RESTORE Act dedicates 80 percent of all administrative and civil penalties related to the Deepwater Horizon spill to a Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund (Trust Fund) and outlines a structure by which the funds can be utilized to restore and protect the natural resources, ecosystems, fisheries, marine and wildlife habitats, beaches, coastal wetlands, and economy of the Gulf Coast region.² The Council has oversight of the expenditure of 60 percent of the funds made available from the Trust Fund.³ Those funds are managed as grants and interagency agreements to eligible recipients.

In 2014, the Council selected EasyGrants™⁴ as an electronic grants management system to support the federal assistance objectives of the RESTORE Act. Working with the vendor and other contractual support, the Council developed the Restoration Assistance and Award Management System (RAAMS) on the EasyGrants platform. Applicants to and recipients of Council programs are required to utilize RAAMS for grant and interagency agreement applications, and to perform grant or agreement administrative tasks. Council applicants and recipients use RAAMS to:

- Submit Proposals⁵
- Submit Applications
- Accept a Grant or IAA
- Request Revisions and Amendments
- Submit Reports
- Submit Supporting Documentation

¹ RESTORE Act; Subtitle F of Public Law 112-14133, 33 U.S.C. § 1321(t)(2)(C)(i).

² RESTORE Act; Subtitle F of Public Law 112-141, Sec. 1602(b).

³ 33 U.S.C. § 1321(t)(2)A and (t)(3)(A)(i).

⁴ Altum, Inc. 1801 Robert Fulton Drive, Suite 450, Reston, VA 20191.

⁵ Planned for submission of next round of the Restore Council Comprehensive Plan Component, Funded Priorities List.



- Close-Out Awards

On September 25, 2017, the Council received notice from Altum that Altum would be sun-setting the Easygrants platform on which RAAMS is built. The Council must now identify a replacement grants management system that ideally will support all of the general functions identified above in the most efficient manner feasible, while facilitating compliance with applicable law and enabling the Council to carry out its responsibility of oversight for these federal funds.

SELECTION METHODOLOGY

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Building on the Council’s previous efforts to select, deploy, and configure RAAMS, as well as the analysis and the recommendations of the Council’s Grants 360 Working Group, the acquisition effort has focused on reviewing and revising solution requirements, investigating alternative solutions, and developing a recommendation for acquisition to achieve the following objectives:

- **Enhance and simplify** the assistance lifecycle experience for all participants, including grant managers, recipients, and sub-recipients.
- **Improve compliance** by reducing the burden to implement changing regulations and statutes (e.g., 2 CFR 200, DATA Act, GREAT ACT, etc.), improving the ability to address existing findings and recommendations, and improving financial auditing capabilities.
- **Improve timeliness and accountability of funding** to support recipients and the public by providing visibility into authoritative data and integration with enterprise financial systems.
- **Streamline and improve business performance** by improving business processes, work flows, analysis, reporting, and performance monitoring, and by providing accurate and timely data to stakeholders to support decision-making.
- **Migration of processes and data** from RAAMS to include maintaining current grant files and associated data.

PROCUREMENT TASK FORCE

The RESTORE Act designates the heads of six federal agencies and the Governors of five Gulf Coast States as Council members and vests the appointment of Council members in the President.⁶ The Act also provides that the State members of the Council (State members) “select” one of the federal members to serve as Chair and vests

⁶ 33 U.S.C. § 1321(t)(2)(C)(ii)



appointment of the Chair in the President.⁷ The Council has established a Steering Committee, pursuant to the Council's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), with the authority to establish committees or working groups to carry out the work of the Council.⁸

The Council System Acquisition Task Force (Task Force) is one such working group, established for the purpose of conducting the analysis of alternatives for a replacement grant system. The Task Force provides this report to the Steering Committee, under the advisement of the Council Executive Director and Chief Financial Officer (CFO). The Task Force Members are supported by Task Force Core Staff, who are individuals from the Council Staff. The Task Force consists of representatives from state and federal Council members, and program, grant, and administrative Council Staff. The Task Force is facilitated by Core Council Staff.

The Task Force held regular meetings, conducted working sessions, reviewed content, and decided on next steps or recommendations. The Task Force operates on consensus. A scribe kept notes for each meeting.

APPROACH OF THE TASK FORCE

In order to efficiently and effectively manage federal awards, federal assistance programs must comply with various statutes, regulations and policy, and must interface with a variety of financial management systems. The Task Force developed a prioritized list of functional requirements and features, conducted an analysis of alternatives for fulfilling those requirements, and now recommends a preferred alternative on the basis of costs, benefits, and risk.

When considering alternative solutions, the Task Force has taken into account recent changes to the federal assistance domain, such as the focus on improved financial and performance management, emphasized in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Uniform Grants Guidance⁹, and the requirements to make information on federal expenditures more easily accessible and transparent found in the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014 (DATA Act).¹⁰ The Task Force has also considered the findings of the 360 Working Group, which was stood up by the Steering Committee in 2017 to review the Council's grant systems, procedures and policies.

The Task Force utilized a number of techniques and resources to carry out the search.

⁷ 33 U.S.C. § 1321(t)(2)(C)(iv)

⁸ RESTORE Council Standard Operating Procedures 2.4.2 (1)(a).

⁹ 2 C.F.R. 200

¹⁰ The DATA Act, Pub.L. 113-101.



These included:

- A review of prior acquisition history for similar or identical requirements.
- Utilizing knowledgeable individuals in other federal agencies and industry.
- A review of recent market research to meet similar or identical requirements.
- Participation in interactive, on-line communications with federal shared service owners.
- On-site visits with federal shared service providers and clients of those providers.

SUMMARY OF INITIAL INVESTIGATION

FIRST STEPS

The Task Force initially focused on understanding the original baseline requirements that informed the decision to acquire RAAMS and updating those requirements from the experience of Council grant operations. The Task Force then utilized a publicly available industry report¹¹ that provided an overview and comparison of a large number of commercial off the shelf (COTS) grants systems. The analysis in that report compared with the baseline requirements provided an efficient means for the Task Force to narrow its consideration to a small number of systems for further consideration. The Task Force also reached out to three other federal agencies that had in the recent past transitioned to or were currently in transition to a federal shared service, to learn from their experiences.¹²

In January 2018, a subset of the Task Force then arranged for in person meetings in DC with the representatives of two federal shared services and one COTS system. However, the short lapse in federal funding required that the team reschedule the meetings, and in the attempt to reschedule, the COTS system owners were non-responsive and the Task Force did not continue to gather information for COTS systems. In February 2018, the Task Force subgroup traveled to DC and had in-depth meetings with the owners of the shared services and a federal agency client of each service.¹³

¹¹ *A Consumers Guide to Grants Management Systems*, Andrei, K., Bernard, C. *et al*, May 2017.

¹² Conference calls with EDA (October 24, 2017), EPA (February 5, 2018) and Denali Commission (March 1, 2018).

¹³ The Task Force met with representatives of USDA OCFO (owners of ezFedGrants), USDA Specialty Crop Block Grant Program - Agricultural Marketing Service (client of ezFedGrants), HHS (owner of GrantSolutions), and Treasury OGCR (client of GrantSolutions) February 20-22, 2018.



ELIMINATION OF COTS OPTIONS

After the meetings in Washington, D.C., the Task Force considered a number of factors, including elements of risk that would be associated with a COTS option. Those considerations included:

- The potential risk that another commercial vendor could make a business decision that it would no longer support the system.
- A COTS system, as opposed to a federal shared service, would shift the cost of compliance with future grant regulations solely to the Council.
- A federal shared service would provide shared resources such as help desk and training that would be the sole responsibility of the Council with a COTS system.
- Ultimately the Council will itself sunset. This is a somewhat unique scenario, but it is assumed that handing off the Council's grants data to a Department level agency will be better facilitated if it ultimately resides on a federal shared service.

Additionally, the OMB Memorandum M-13-08, *Improving Financial Systems through Shared Services*, which directs federal agencies to move from agency-specific financial systems to federal shared service providers (FSSPs), consolidate financial management systems, and use existing FSSP operations and maintenance teams to support systems and infrastructures.¹⁴ Pursuant to this directive, and for the reasons identified above regarding the potential risks and the measures the Council can take to mitigate those risks, the Task Force has opted to only continue consideration of federal shared services for the RAAMS replacement.

MOVING FORWARD WITH THE FINAL ANALYSIS

On March 22 and April 5, 2018, the Task Force arranged for webinar demonstrations of the two federal shared services. The Task Force also requested that each system owner provide a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate of the implementation and operating costs. At the conclusion of the respective demonstrations, the Task Force reached consensus that there was sufficient information to provide the Steering Committee with analysis and a recommendation.

¹⁴ OMB, M-13-08, "Improving Financial Systems Through Shared Services," March 25, 2013.



ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

No-Action alternative

If the Council does not select a replacement system, Council Members and Staff will be required to submit and review grant applications and reports transmitted by email or post. Procedures would have to be developed for maintaining records and transmitting information, and these procedures would consume many more staff hours than are currently available for managing the grants, by both recipients and the Council.

Non-Viable Alternatives –Mitigating Risk

One of the key issues in the selection of a grant system replacement is the long-term viability of the system. As the Council's own experience demonstrates, there is significant risk that a COTS vendor could make a business decision to end support for a grants management software solution. It is possible that a federal shared service would terminate a federal shared grant management service for political or budgetary reasons, however that risk would be significantly mitigated by the diversity and volume of federal agency clients that would advocate their interest in preserving it. For that reason, the Task Force chose to not expend continued effort exploring COTS options beyond the initial investigation. This decision is reinforced by the aforementioned OMB guidance to federal agencies to select federal shared services when feasible and requirements can be met.

Federal Shared Services

ezFedGrants

ezFedGrants is an online USDA grants and agreements management system that facilitates management of USDA grants and agreements, including creating applications, digitally signing agreement documents, submitting claims, preparing progress reports, and reviewing historical grant/agreement information. ezFedGrants is part of the USDA's Financial Shared Service offering. It is integrated with the USDA's core accounting system, and, for certain Agencies/Offices, interacts with other financial systems, such as ASAP. ezFedGrants is the USDA's OMB Circular A-123 system of record for processing Federal financial assistance transactions, supports the USDA's mission, and helps to ensure compliance with Federal requirements for grants and accounting.



GrantSolutions

The GrantSolutions Grants Management Module (GMM) is a web-based comprehensive grants management system provided by the Grants Center of Excellence (COE). The system is available to all Federal grant-making agencies as part of the Grants Management Line of Business (GMLoB) initiative. It services all types of grants (service, training, demonstration, social research, and cooperative agreements) across all grant categories (discretionary, formula, block, and entitlement).

GrantSolutions products and services provide comprehensive, flexible, cost-effective solutions for both Grantors and Recipients. These solutions support the sharing of common grant and program management processes over a broad range of programs while incorporating the unique needs of each grant program.

CONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENTS AND FEATURES

The Task Force identified 38 baseline requirements and features that it would use in evaluating the various systems under consideration. These elements were grouped into four categories depending on their necessity and impact: Baseline, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.

Category	Description	Weighting
Baseline	Requirements to facilitate current business processes and meet Federal System requirements.	5
Tier 1	Requirements needed to collect grant process metrics and grant data for Federal Reporting.	3
Tier 2	Requirements to connect with external systems and reporting capabilities.	2
Tier 3	Requirements that further enable efficient processing of grants applications.	1

In addition, a weighting factor was added to each category based on the Council’s current business process and how critical the requirements are to ensure grants can be issued and managed.



For each element, the systems were given a status of *Meets*, *Somewhat Meets*, or *Does Not Meet*. *Meets* was assigned a point value of 10, *Somewhat meets* was assigned a point Value of 5 and *Does not Meet* was assigned point value of 0. The weighting factor was then multiplied by the score in each category for an overall score.

Both ezFedGrants and GrantSolutions were then assessed using this tool following the conclusion of on-site visits and subsequent web demos and scored.

System	Baseline (5)	Tier 1 (3)	Tier 2 (2)	Tier 3 (1)	Total
GrantSolutions	525	75	100	50	760
ezFedGrants	500	30	120	40	690

Using this scoring model, GrantSolutions earned a score of 760; ezFedGrants earned a score of 690. It should be noted that in addition to the scoring other factors were also considered as detailed in subsequent sections.

COMPARISON OF COSTS

Cost of RAAMS

For the purpose of comparing the alternatives, it is useful to first consider the baseline costs of RAAMS. The EasyGrants platform (which was configured as RAAMS for the Council) was procured March 3, 2015. RAAMS was first online and available for use in its initial configuration in December 2015.

Capitalized Costs (Acquisition and Initial Implementation)	
NTIS/Altum Contracts (Initial Configuration and all Enhancements)	\$789,867.86
VMSI Implementation support	\$297,000.00
Startup Total	\$1,086,867.86
Annual Operating Costs (beginning December 2015)	
Altum licensing and basic service	\$56,276.20
VMSI support - help desk, administration, configuration, maintenance, testing ¹⁵	\$307,019.92
USGS hosting	\$209,150.00
Annual Operating Costs	\$572,446.12

¹⁵ As RAAMS has matured, VMSI support has evolved to address additional Restore Council needs not directly related to RAAMS including providing reporting, managing the Council's responsibilities for USAspending, developing SOPs and other necessary documentation, etc.



Cost of Grant Solutions

Grant Solutions provided a ROM Estimate of Costs for preparation of this analysis. The costs may increase/decrease based upon requirements during implementation.

Capitalized Costs (Acquisition and Initial Implementation)	
Fit-Gap analysis	\$89,575
Initial Implementation	\$253,000 - \$320,000
Startup Total	\$409,575
Expected Operating Costs	
Operations and Maintenance	\$365,725

Cost of eZFedGrants

USDA OCFO also provided a ROM Estimate of Costs for ezFedGrants, for purposes of this analysis. The costs may increase/decrease based upon requirements during implementation.

Capitalized Costs (Acquisition and Initial Implementation)	
Pre-Discovery/Fit-Gap analysis	\$48,000
Initial Implementation	\$498,355
Startup Total	\$498,355
Expected Operating Costs	
Operations and Maintenance	\$28,500



Summary Comparison of Costs

Costs	RAAMS	ezFedGrants	GrantSolutions
Total Implementation	\$1,086,867.86	\$546,395	\$409,575
Annual Operating Costs	\$572,446.12	\$28,500	\$365,725

While both federal shared services appear to offer savings over RAAMS, there are a number of unknowns in these cost estimates. For example, the ROM estimates are for basic services and do not include Council program configurations or enhancements. Any enhancements would add to the implementation and potentially the annual operating costs. Unfortunately, the Council cannot determine those specific costs until after the conclusion of the fit gap analysis.

While cost is an important consideration, it is the consensus of the Task Force that other issues bear even greater weight.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Implementation Schedule

The Council has three more option years on its agreement to continue servicing RAAMS. However, the Task Force does not have significant confidence that vendor will continue the level of service the Council expects and needs as time goes on. The vendor is sun-setting the entire system, not just the contract with the Council, so there is no long-term value proposition for Altum to invest funds in servicing the system and their clients. The Task Force advises a rapid transition to a new service.

Timelines for implementation are dependent on the fit gap analysis process for each service. During this fit gap process a program manager will be assigned to the Council to build out a comprehensive timeline. Additionally, for either fit gap analysis, Council Staff will need to be available for a series of comprehensive meetings over a number of weeks so that the system owners can learn the Council's workflows, processes, and data configurations in RAAMS.

The ezFedGrants service would first involve a 2-3 month timeframe for procurement. This would be followed by a one-month engagement for the fit gap analysis and then 4-6 months for implementation. However, the ezFedGrants team has informed the Task Force that the USDA budget for new releases in ezFedGrants has been set for FY18 and FY19. This means that USDA could not initiate implementation of an ezFedGrants service for the Council until FY20 without the approval of the USDA Deputy Secretary. To facilitate



implementation in FY19, the Council leadership would have to engage USDA at the highest levels to request the budget plan be altered to include a release of the Restore ezFedGrants service.

The GrantSolutions fit gap analysis would take approximately 2.5 months and could commence shortly after May 15, 2018. Additionally, the GrantSolutions team has built their ROM for implementation based on an aggressive “go live” date of January 2019. This would require that all implementation activities would be completed in approximately 5 months from August through December 2018.

System Ecology

GrantSolutions has a much wider group of diverse federal agencies as clients. As such GrantSolutions has developed solutions for numerous and varied programmatic requirements. GrantSolutions is receptive to customizations within the grants process and appear able to accommodate a wide range of requests.

ezFedGrants currently has only USDA customers and is focused on how USDA performs the grants management processes. These processes may not include agency specific requirements that are necessary for Council business processes. The Task Force noted that customizations to the software to facilitate agency grant requirements have to be approved through a ezFedGrants configuration control board and are only implemented if the customization benefits all customers of the system.

Both services actively work to ensure all general Federal grant regulations and requirements, such as USAspending or the GREAT Act addressed within the service.

Affinities and Efficiencies and Discussion of Risk

GrantSolutions is the service that the U.S. Department of Treasury Office of Gulf Coast Restoration (OGCR) uses to administer the RESTORE Act Direct Component grants. Several of the recipient staff and offices that are involved in the administration of the Direct Component grants will also be managing awards from the Council under the Comprehensive Plan Program and Spill Impact Component Program. The familiarity of staff with the user interface and functions of Grant Solutions will provide efficiencies for the Council grant managers to transition to a GrantSolutions based system.

With regard to the relative overall risk of each service, the Task Force has several concerns that weigh heavily in its recommendation:

- The relative “newness” of ezFedGrants creates unknowns and uncertainties. The Council would be the first non-USDA client on the ezFedGrants platform. EzFedGrants is a new system that only recently gained the capability for applicant/recipient access. Grant Solutions is a much more mature platform with a proven track record of serving agencies outside HHS.



- The robustness of the GrantSolutions system ecology is a strength that mitigates risk. The Council’s experience of being “stranded” on a platform that is sun-setting significantly influences the Task Force’s consideration of this risk. It is the Task Force’s credible consumption the expansive client base and related interests of GrantSolutions will ensure that GrantSolutions is less likely to sunset, or if it does, there will be strength in numbers for implementing a transition.
- The limitation that the FY18 and FY19 USDA budget for new releases in ezFedGrants does not, and will not, include the Council without intervention from leadership is another serious risk consideration. Should the Task Force select ezFedGrants, the Council must be willing to accept the risk that leadership advocacy could be unsuccessful, in which case the Council would bear the additional risk of not transitioning to a new grant system until 4-6 months into FY20. That is a significant risk given the uncertainty surrounding Altum’s continued effective support of RAAMS.

RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation is based upon the best information currently available to the Task Force. The recommendation takes into consideration the high-level requirements of the Council’s grant management business, it compares the capabilities of the two federal shared services, considers the cost of each service, and evaluates the overall risk.

Based on all of these considerations the Task Force recommends the Council procure GrantSolutions.



Appendix A: Requirements and Features Scoring Sheet

Requirements/Features	Grant Solutions	*Notes	EZFedGrants	Scoring and Weighting - The Baseline Requirements are weighted highest (Meets = 50, Somewhat Meets = 25, Does Not Meet=0); The Tier 1-4 Features have diminishing proportional weights (e.g. Tier 1 Meets= 25, Somewhat Meets=15, Does Not Meet=0; etc.)		
				*Notes	GS Score	EZFG Score
Available to GCERC?	Meets		Meets		50	50
PIBMA Accredited (PIBIRAMP, AFD, 60)	Meets		Meets		50	50
DATA Act Compliant (Collects All FABS Attributes)	Meets		Meets		50	50
Supports Full Grants Management Life Cycle (Application, Award, Financial Reporting, Performance Reporting, Amendments, and Close-Out)	Meets		Meets		50	50
Supports Both Grants and IAAs	Somewhat Meets	Additional info is needed on this subject	Does Not Meet	The system owners plan on meeting this requirement during 2018	25	0
Basic Integrated and Configurable Reporting	Meets		Meets		50	50
Configurability (Custom Data Elements and Workflows)	Somewhat Meets	All custom elements must be routed through the Grants Solutions team (and at additional cost)	Somewhat Meets	Limited customization is available to the client agency. Other elements must be routed through the EZFedGrants Team	25	25
System of Record for Documentation	Meets		Meets		50	50
SP 424 Data Elements and Required Award Attributes, Including Object Class Category Budgets	Meets		Meets		50	50
Automated System Email Capability	Meets		Meets		50	50
Internal Controls (Workflows, Permissions, Task Assignments, etc.)	Meets		Meets		50	50
Multiple Reviewer Capability	Somewhat Meets	More info is needed; multiple review functionality is available, but may have limited structural options	Somewhat Meets	More info is needed; multiple review functionality is available, but may have limited structural options	25	25



Requirements/Features	Grant Solutions	*Notes	EZFedGrants	Scoring and Weighting - The Baseline Requirements are weighted highest (Meets = 50, Somewhat Meets = 25, Does Not Meet=0); The Tier 1-4 Features have diminishing proportional weights (e.g. Tier 1 Meets= 25, Somewhat Meets=15, Does Not Meet=0; etc.)			
				*Notes	GS Score	EZFG Score	
Tier 1	GREAT Act Strategy/Implementation	Somewhat Meets	GREAT Act Data standards have not yet been determined. However, as a shared service provider, the system owners will be required to adhere to those standards, and have demonstrated past ability to meet similar requirements (e.g., DATA Act)	Somewhat Meets	GREAT Act Data standards have not yet been determined. However, as a shared service provider, the system owners will be required to adhere to those standards, and have demonstrated past ability to meet similar requirements (e.g., DATA Act)	15	15
	Testing Environment	Somewhat Meets	The Testing Environment is currently only available to organizations with active development and testing	Does Not Meet	A testing environment is planned with a projected 2018 rollout	15	0
	Milestones Capability	Somewhat Meets	OGCR is using a custom form to capture structured milestone and metrics data. However, this data is not currently being reported on, and does not carry forward through the life of the award.	Does Not Meet	Any milestones are collected via upload	15	0
	Metrics Capability	Somewhat Meets	OGCR is using a custom form to capture structured milestone and metrics data. However, this data is not currently being reported on, and does not carry forward through the life of the award.	Does Not Meet	Any metrics are collected via upload	15	0
	Payment Requests for High-Risk Grantees	Somewhat Meets	At-will tasks for various actions can be configured within the system.	Somewhat Meets	Some ability exists for payments. However, it is unknown if that functionality can co-exist with our usage of ASAP as a Payment tool.	15	15



Requirements/Features	Grant Solutions	*Notes	EZFedGrants	Scoring and Weighting - The Baseline Requirements are weighted highest (Meets = 50, Somewhat Meets = 25, Does Not Meet=0); The Tier 1-4 Features have diminishing proportional weights (e.g. Tier 1 Meets=25, Somewhat Meets=15, Does Not Meet=0; etc.)			
				*Notes	GS Score	EZFG Score	
Tier 2	ASAP Integration	Somewhat Meets	No Payment data is being pulled into the system from ASAP; but Denali Commission with GrantSolutiuons is working to create this functionality; Restore staff are participating	Meets	Payment data is pulled into the system from ASAP	10	20
	ARC and Oracle Integration	Does Not Meet	Plans to meet; this item is in progress and being funded by the Denali Commission.	Does Not Meet	No planned functionality at present.	0	0
	Document Creation (Awards, Amendments, etc.)	Meets	Automated; awards and amendments are not customizable without additional build-out	Meets	Automated; awards and amendments are not customizable without additional build-out	20	20
	Accepts Pre-Applications and Proposals	Does Not Meet	Does not have the ability to accept proposals that might dramatically change as part of Council decisions	Does Not Meet	Does not have the ability to accept proposals that might dramatically change as part of Council decisions	0	0
	Advanced Reporting (via Integrated Capabilities or Extensions)	Meets	Moderately advanced reporting capability is bundled with the system	Meets	Moderately advanced reporting capability is bundled with the system	20	20
	Upfront Cost	Unknown		Unknown		0	
	Operating Cost	Unknown		Unknown		0	0
	Multi-Term Budget Capability	Meets		Meets		20	20
	Automated Reminders	Meets	Both have configurable email reminders based on actions	Meets	Both have configurable email reminders based on actions	20	20
	Multi-Project Program Grant Tracking	Somewhat Meets	Project documentation can be uploaded and attached	Somewhat Meets	Project documentation can be uploaded and attached	10	10
	Versioned Data	Somewhat Meets	More info is needed on this attribute	Somewhat Meets	More info is needed on this attribute; does appear to have some functionality on this attribute	10	10
	Post-Award Monitoring Data (Site Visit Results, etc.)	Does Not Meet	All site visit results are handled via uploads	Does Not Meet	All site visit results are handled via uploads	0	0



Requirements/Features	Grant Solutions	*Notes	EZFedGrants	Scoring and Weighting - The Baseline Requirements are weighted highest (Meets = 50, Somewhat Meets = 25, Does Not Meet=0). The Tier 1-4 Features have diminishing proportional weights (e.g. Teir 1 Meets= 25, Somewhat Meets=15, Does Not Meet=0, etc.)			
				*Notes	GS Score	EZFG Score	
Tier 3	Leveraged Funding Data Collection and Tracking	Does Not Meet	Can upload attachments as an alternative	Does Not Meet	Can upload attachments as an alternative	0	0
	GIS Capability	Does Not Meet	System does not allow zip files	Somewhat Meets	Zip files can be uploaded	0	5
	Land Acquisition Data Types and Tracking	Somewhat Meets	Limited previews of this functionality were shown. The full features of this capability are unknown.	Does Not Meet	No tracking mechanism exists	5	0
	Electronic Signatures	Meets		Meets		10	10
	Equipment Tracking	Somewhat Meets	Limited previews of this functionality were shown. The full features of this capability are unknown.	Does Not Meet	No tracking mechanism exists	5	0
	Special Award Condition Management and Tracking	Meets	SACs can be managed in the system and appended to an award as needed	Meets	SACs can be managed in the system and appended to an award as needed	10	10
	Environmental Compliance Tracking	Somewhat Meets	OGCR is using a custom, structured form to capture this data.	Does Not Meet	Can upload attachments	5	0
	BAS Science Review Process	Somewhat Meets	Potential for multiple reviewer set-up - how this would integrate with internal review process is unclear	Somewhat Meets	Potential for multiple reviewer set-up - how this would integrate with internal review process is unclear	5	5
FABS Report Generation (Automated Post-Processing of FABS-Compliant Reports)	Meets	The system is able to generate FABS-compliant reports	Meets	The system is able to generate FABS-compliant reports	10	10	
TOTAL SCORES						760.00	690.00