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Contract and Grant Administration
Q1: When forms are missing and gets sent back to the departments for additional documentation, does it go back to the bottom of the worklist?

A1: Marcia's opinion: I don't know the answer, but I think they SHOULD go to the bottom of the worklist. Otherwise, we would be encouraging people to submit incomplete packages just to get a place in line. That would increase OCGA workload and would be unfair to those who submit a complete package.

Q2: Is it possible for the team to extend the length of time in the online EPASS system before you get timed-out/kicked off?

A2: I will ask ORIS to extend the time. -Marcia

Q3: After a Subaward is executed by OCGA, can a copy of the Subaward Checklist be forwarded to UCLA Purchasing? Sometimes the Checklist contains specific instructions on the FAUs to use. If this information does not get transmitted to Purchasing, then sometimes Purchasing processes the Subaward using wrong FAUs, which takes additional time to correct.

A3: OST used to do this; however, OST has transitioned to include the FAU on the actual agreement/amendment so that it is right there on the document for Purchasing.

The OST has worked with Purchasing to address this issue. The OST communicates the FAU information, which was provided by the Dept on the Subaward Checklist, to Purchasing via the Subaward Agreement or Amendment (the FAU is usually included on the Subaward Agreement or at the bottom of the amendment). If you see issues with the listed FAU, please do let us know.

Q4: Have there been any thought to create an EPASS like electronic routing for OST to streamline the process and ensure forms are provided upfront?

A4: An electronic form is something that we would like to develop, but this is still something for the future. We might be more able to develop an electronic form once we move into OCGA's internal system.

Q5: I thought for continuation and also new subaward, we have to include the current/updated award synopsis, since the delay in submitting the complete continuation subaward packet. Is the current/updated award synopsis no longer required for continuation? I had a case in which the updated award synopsis was delayed due to CIRC review, hence delay in sending the continuation subaward packet.

A5: The award synopsis is included as a required document in the Attachments section on page 2. But we also encourage the review of the snapshot prior to the submission of your checklist. The snapshot for the current period, along with the award notification e-mail, both are good ways to know when your award is setup. CIRC review is something that needs to happen prior to award setup.
Q6: For Subaward team: AP and Purchasing are really pushing Transcepta on everyone, and a lot of our subawardees have therefore signed up for it. But when they do, we at the department level are not able to see invoices and or certify them in a timely manner. There is no system that updates us when an invoice is uploaded. Right now the average turn-around time for my department to be notified that there is an invoice that they are waiting for a Sub Cert Form is 3 MONTHS, which is unacceptable.

A6: We can share this comment with Purchasing and see if they have a solution.

Q7: For Subaward team: With the new changes that are going to happen with subaward management, is there a way to make MCA’s viewable in the financial system? To either have them show up like a TOF does where we can see ledger detail, or have those invoices routed to us for review and certification before they’re paid, like any other subward? As it is now, we at the department level cannot see ledger detail for any MCA’s, and any sister UC campus gets their invoices paid automatically, without the PI reviewing and certifying their invoices like we have to do with other subs.

A7: I can address your invoice question. UC MCA process under RPAC memo 14-08, the default under that process is for IRRs to be submitted directly to EFM. If you'd like any further detail to be submitted directly to you in addition to the IRRs, let us know on the MCA Checklist in the text box on page 2. In that text box you can add any additional reporting that you'd like to have added.

Q8: Just to confirm that this certification is only if staff or subcontractors have direct contact with county staff. If not, do we need to keep any records for this county requirement?

A8: When LA County requests it, UCLA submits a Certification of Compliance for a specific contract. UCLA certifies that "ALL" or "MOSTLY ALL" Contractor Personnel assigned to a contract are vaccinated. When "MOSTLY ALL" is selected, UCLA is required to provide names of individuals who are not vaccinated and will perform work on County owned, County-controlled property and/or have or will have in-person contact with County Workforce. The County expects all COVID records to be retained for the retention period of the contract.

Q9: Can you please clarify if the COVID vaccine mandate for County and City of LA is applicable only for City or County grants?

A9: Yes, it is specific to City and County contracts and personnel working under them.

Q10: If the title of the project changes after we submit the 700U, do we have to get a new one re-signed in Docusign?

A10: Yes, if the title changes the form must be updated and signed via DocuSign, otherwise we wouldn’t have any other identifying information to clearly match the signed form with the project.

Q11: What about project number of an active subward? Will that auto-populate?

A11: The parent subaward project number may need to be entered, if not captured due to missing information on the received subaward documentation.
Q12: Clarification needed on this: Do not include the project for which Other Support is being reported. So if this is JIT, we should remove the project from Pending and if this is for RPPR, we should remove it from Active?

A12: For JIT, the project under which the OS is being submitted, does not need to be included on the OS. For the RPPR all items should be included.