

Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council

Quality Improvement Committee Meeting

1:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 17, 2021

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81144509622?pwd=SFNBM1RScVFabHkzakVpaUZoeHhldz09>

Meeting ID: 811 4450 9622 Passcode: 125672

Or, call in by dialing: 346 248 7799

Agenda

- I. Call to Order Kevin Aloysius and
Steven Vargas, Co-Chairs
- A. Moment of Appreciation and Reflection
 - B. Adoption of Agenda
 - C. Approval of the Minutes (July 13, 2021)
- II. Public Comment
- NOTE: If you wish to speak during the Public Comment portion of the meeting, please sign up on the clipboard at the front of the room. No one is required to give his or her name or HIV status. All meetings are audio taped by the Office of Support for use in creating the meeting minutes. The audiotape and the minutes are public record. If you state your name or HIV status it will be on public record. If you would like your health status known, but do not wish to state your name, you can simply say: "I am a person living with HIV", before stating your opinion. If you represent an organization, please state that you are representing an agency and give the name of the organization. If you work for an organization, but are representing yourself, please state that you are attending as an individual and not as an agency representative. Individuals can also submit written comments to a member of the staff who would be happy to read the comments on behalf of the individual at this point in the meeting.
- III. Reports from Ryan White Administrative Agents Carin Martin
Patrick Martin
- A. Ryan White Part A and MAI
 - B. Ryan White Part B and State Services (SS)
- IV. New Business Ricardo Mora
- A. FY 2021 Assessment of the RW Part A Administrative Mechanism
- V. Announcements
- VI. Adjourn

Houston Area HIV Services Ryan White Planning Council

Quality Improvement Committee
2:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 13, 2021
Meeting Location: Zoom teleconference

Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Steven Vargas, Co-Chair
Kevin Aloysius, Co-Chair
Ardry Skeet Boyle
Johanna Castillo
Josh Mica
Oscar Perez
Pete Rodriguez
Gloria Sierra
Crystal Starr
Marcelly Macias
Cecilia Ligons
Karla Mills
Tana Pradia
Deborah Somoye

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ahmier Gibson
Nkechi Onyewuenyi, excused
Andrew Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT

Patrick Martin, TRG
Tiffany Shepherd, TRG
Carin Martin, RWGA
Heather Keizman, RWGA
Tori Williams, Ofc of Support
Ricardo Mora, Ofc of Support
Diane Beck, Ofc of Support

Call to Order: Steven Vargas, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and asked for a moment of reflection.

Adoption of the Agenda: *Motion #1*: it was moved and seconded (Starr, Pradia) to adopt the agenda. **Motion carried.**

Approval of the Minutes: *Motion #2*: it was moved and seconded (Ligons, Pradia) to approve the May 11, 2021 meeting minutes. **Motion carried.** Abstentions: Macias, Mica, Starr.

Public Comment: None.

Reports from Ryan White Administrative Agents

Ryan White Part A and MAI: Martin presented the attached reports. She said that they are anticipating a large amount of carryover funds and are currently working to finalize 2020.

- FY21 RW Part A & MAI Procurement Report dated 05/26/21
- FY20 RW Part A & MAI Procurement Report dated 05/26/21
- FY20 RW Part A & MAI Service Utilization Report dated 05/26/21
- FY20 Performance Measures and Highlights: Keizman presented the attached document.

Ryan White Part B and State Services (SS): Shepherd presented the attached reports:

- FY20/21 DSHS SS Procurement Report

Scribe: D. Beck

JA = Just arrived at meeting
 LR = Left room temporarily
 LM = Left the meeting
 C = Chaired the meeting

2021 Quality Improvement Meeting Voting Record for Meeting Date 07/13/21

MEMBERS:	Motion #1 Agenda				Motion #2 Minutes				Motion #3 Table the Assessment of the RW Pt A Admin Mech				Motion #4 2021 Idea Form – page 1 only			
	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Steven Vargas, Co-Chair				C				C				C				C
Kevin Aloysius, Co-Chair lm 1:53		X				X						X		X		
Ardry Skeet Boyle ja 1:15	X				X							X		X		
Johanna Castillo		X				X				X				X		
Ahmier Gibson	X				X				X				X			
Josh Mica		X						X		X				X		
Nkechi Onyewuenyi	X				X				X				X			
Oscar Perez		X				X				X				X		
Pete Rodriguez		X				X					X			X		
Gloria Sierra ja 1:11	X				X					X				X		
Crystal Starr		X						X		X				X		
Andrew Wilson	X				X				X				X			
Cecilia Ligons		X				X				X				X		
Marcely Macias		X						X		X				X		
Karla Mills		X			X					X				X		
Tana Pradia		X			X					X				X		
Deborah Somoye ja 1:13, lm 1:53	X				X					X				X		

**Houston Area
Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program
Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism**

**Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI)
Fiscal Year 2020**

Prepared by
Houston Area Ryan White Planning Council
Office of Support
Approved: Pending

**Houston Area
Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program
Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism
Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI)
Fiscal Year 2020**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Background	3
Methodology	3
Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI)	4
Contract Period: March 1, 2020 – February 29, 2021 (FY20)	
Summary of Findings.....	4
Completed Assessment Checklist.....	6

Background

The Ryan White CARE Act requires local Planning Councils to “assess the efficiency of the administrative mechanism in rapidly allocating funds to the areas of greatest need within the eligible area.”¹ To meet this mandate, a time-specific document review of local procurement, expenditure, and reimbursement processes for Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program funds is conducted annually by local Planning Councils.² The observation process is not intended to evaluate either the local administrative agencies for Ryan White funds or the individual service providers funded by Ryan White.³ Instead, it produces information about procurement, expenditure, and reimbursement processes for the local *system* of Ryan White funding that can be used for overall quality assurance purposes.

In the Houston eligible area, the Ryan White Planning Council has conducted an assessment of the administrative mechanism for Ryan White Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) funds each fiscal year beginning in 2006. In 2012, the Planning Council began assessing the administrative mechanism for Part B and Texas State General Funds (State Services) as well. Consequently, the assessment tool used to conduct the assessment was amended to accommodate Part B and State Services processes. The new tool was developed and approved by the Quality Assurance Committee of the Planning Council on March 21, 2013 and approved by the Full Council on April 11, 2013.

Methodology

In June 2021, the approved assessment tool was applied to the administrative mechanism for Part A and MAI funds. The approved assessment tool will be applied to the administrative mechanism for Part B and State Services funds in November 2021. The contract periods designated in the tool are:

- Part A and MAI: March 1, 2020 – February 29, 2021 (FY20)
- Part B: April 1, 2019 –March 31, 2020 (FY 1920)
- State Services: Most recent completed FY

The tool evaluated three areas of each administrative mechanism: (1) the procurement and Request for Proposals (RFP) process, (2) the reimbursement process, and (3) the contract monitoring process. As outlined in the tool, 10 data points and their respective data sources were assessed for each administrative mechanism for the specified time frames. Application of the checklist, including data collection, analysis, and reporting, was performed by the Ryan White Planning Council Office of Support staff. All data and documents reviewed in the process were publicly available. Findings from the assessment process have been reported for each administration mechanism independently and are accompanied by the respective completed assessment tool.

¹Ryan White Program Manual, Section V, Chapter 1, Page 4

²Ibid, Page 7

³Ibid, Page 8

Part A and Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI)
Contract Period: March 1, 2020 – February 29, 2021 (FY20)

Summary of Findings

I. Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

- a) The Administrative Agent (**AA**) for Part A and MAI typically processes extensions of Part A and MAI contracts and positions with Commissioners Court prior to receipt of the Notice of Grant Award (**NGA**). As a result of this practice, extension of positions for FY20 occurred prior to receipt of the FY20 NGA. Twenty-seven (27) days elapsed between receipt of the NGA by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers, and there were no lapses in services to consumers.
- b) Due to the extensions of Part A and MAI contracts and positions described in (a) above, 100% of the FY20 Part A and MAI grant award was procured to funded service providers by the first day of the contract period (03/01/20).
- c) The AA procured funds in FY20 only to Planning Council-approved Service Categories. Moreover, the amounts of funds procured per Service Category at the beginning of the contract period matched Planning Council-approved final allocations for level funding for FY20 following application of the Increase Funding Scenario. During the contract period, the AA applied Planning Council-approved policies for the shifting of funds within Service Categories, including application of the increased funding scenarios for Part A and MAI, billing reconciliations, and receipt of carry-over funds in approved categories.
- d) Beginning in FY12, Part A and MAI services could be contracted for up to four years, with Service Categories rotated for bidding every three years. According to this schedule, there were no Requests for Proposal (RFP) issued in FY20. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate communication by AAs to potential bidders specific to the grant award process.
- e) As described in (d) above, no RFP was issued in FY20. According to the schedule mentioned above in d), no Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued in FY20. As such, it is not possible to evaluate communication by AAs to potential bidders specific to Planning Council products
- f) The AA procured 100% of total service dollars for Part A and MAI by the end of the contract period, including the addition of reconciliations and carry-over funds.
- g) There were unspent service dollars in both Part A and MAI at the end of the FY20 contract period that occurred in Primary Care, Medical Case Management, Local Pharmacy Assistance Program, Outreach Services and Service Linkage. The total amount of unspent service funds for both Part A and MAI was \$5,593,019 or 25.4% of the total allocation for service dollars for the contract period. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of FY20 Part A service dollars and sixty-three percent (63%) of MAI service dollars were expended by the end of the fiscal year. The substantial percentage of unspent Part A service dollars was due to the impact of COVID-19 on health care delivery systems throughout the US in 2020. This difficulty in expending Ryan White service dollars was recognized by HRSA as they waived the penalty for EMA's who returned more than 5% of the formula funds awarded. The Houston EMA was able to reallocate a significant portion of these unspent funds to the State ADAP Program, which is currently experiencing a \$52 million deficient.
- h) In FY20, the AA continued to communicate to the Planning Council the results of the procurement process, including agendaizing procurement reports at Committee and Full Council meetings throughout the contract period.

II. Reimbursement Process

- i) The average number of days elapsed between receipt of an accurate Contractor Reimbursement Report (**CER**) from contracted agencies and the issuance of payment by the AA for FY20 was 21 days. The AA paid all contracted Part A and/or MAI agencies within an average of 35 days following receipt of an accurate invoice.

III. Monitoring Process

- j) There were no RFPs issued in FY20, therefore the AA's use of the Standards of Care as part of the contract selection process cannot be evaluated. The monitoring process that took place in FY20 used Standards of Care and clearly indicated this in various quality management policies, procedures, and plans, including the AA's Policy and Procedure for Performing Site Visits and the AA's current Quality Management Plan.

Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>a) How much time elapsed between receipt of the NGA or funding contract by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers (i.e., 30, 60, 90 days)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administrative Agent (AA) for Part A and MAI typically processes extensions of Part A and MAI contracts and positions with Commissioners Court prior to receipt of the Notice of Grant Award (NGA) in order to prevent lapses in services to consumers. • For the FY20 contract period, extensions of positions and contract renewals for Part A and MAI service providers were approved at Commissioners Court meetings on 02/11/2020. • The Part A and MAI initial NGA was received on 01/29/2020 (partial) and executed at the Commissioner’s Court meeting on 03/10/2020. Twenty-seven (27) business days elapsed between receipt of the initial NGA by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers. • The Part A and MAI final NGA was received on 04/07/2020 and amended at the Commissioner’s Court meeting on 4/28/2020. Twenty-two (22) business days elapsed between receipt of the final NGA by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers. • The Part A and MAI Carryover Award was received on 09/11/2020 and authorized for an amendment to accept the carryover funds at the Commissioner’s Court meeting on 10/13/2020. Twenty (20) business days elapsed between receipt of the Carryover Award by the AA and contract execution. <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Because the AA rapid processed contract and position extensions, extension of positions for FY20 occurred prior to issuance of the FY20 NGA. Twenty-seven (27) business days elapsed between receipt of the initial NGA by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers. Twenty-two (22) business days elapsed between receipt of the final NGA by the AA and contract execution with funded service providers. Twenty (20) business days elapsed between receipt of the Carryover Award by the AA and contract execution.</p>	<p>Time between receipt of NGA or funding contract by the AA and when contracts are executed with funded service providers</p>	<p>FY20 Part A and MAI NGA (issued 01/29/2020, 04/07/2020, 09/11/2020)</p> <p>Commissioner’s Court Agendas (02/11/2020, 03/10/2020, 04/28/2020, 10/13/2020)</p>

Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
b) What percentage of the grant award was procured by the: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1st quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd quarter? <input type="checkbox"/> 3rd quarter?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY20 procurement reports from the AA indicate that all allocated funds in each Service Category were procured by 03/01/2020, the first day of the contract period. This is due to the contract and position extensions processed by the AA prior to receipt of the NGA, as described in (a) above. <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Because of contract and position extensions processed by the AA in anticipation of the grant award, 100% of the Part A and MAI grant award was procured by the 1st quarter of the contract period.</p>	Time between receipt of NGA or funding contract by the AA and when funds are procured to contracted service providers	FY20 Part A and MAI Procurement Report provided by the AA to the PC (05/26/2021)

Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>c) Did the awarding of funds in specific categories match the allocations established by the Planning Council?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Planning Council makes allocations per Service Category for each upcoming contract period based on the assumption of level funding. It then designs scenarios to be applied in the event of an increase or decrease in funding per the actual NGA. The Planning Council further permits the AA to re-allocate funds within Service Categories (up to 10%) without pre-approval throughout the contract period for standard business practice reasons, such as billing reconciliations, and to apply carry-over funds as directed. In addition, the Planning Council allows the AA to shift funds in the final quarter of the contract period in order to prevent the grantee from leaving more than 5% of its formula funds unspent. The most recent FY20 procurement report from the AA (dated 05/26/2021) shows that the Service Categories and amounts of funds per Service Category procured at the beginning of the contract period matched the final Planning Council-approved allocations for level funding for FY20. Upon receipt of the NGA, the Increase Scenario was applied for the \$84,963 (0.4%) increase in Part A Formula and Supplemental service dollars. The AA applied the Increase Scenario to the \$115,502 (5.0%) service dollar increase in MAI. As a result, total allocations for FY20 matched the allocations established by the Planning Council with application of the Increase Funding Scenario. <p><i>Conclusion:</i> The AA procured funds in FY20 only to Planning Council-approved Service Categories, and the amounts of funds per Service Category procured at the beginning of the contract period were a match to final allocations approved by the Planning Council for level funding. The AA applied Planning Council-approved policies for the shifting of funds within Service Categories during the contract period, including increased funding scenarios, billing reconciliations, and receipt of carryover funds.</p>	<p>Comparison of the list of service categories awarded funds by the AA to the list of allocations made by the PC</p>	<p>FY20 Part A and MAI Procurement Report provided by the AA to the PC (05/26/2021)</p> <p>PC FY20 Allocations Level Funding Scenario (06/08/2020)</p> <p>PC FY20 Allocations Increase Scenario (08/08/2019)</p>

Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>d) Does the AA have a grant award process which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provides bidders with information on applying for grants? <input type="checkbox"/> Offers a bidder's conference? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning in FY12, Part A and MAI services could be contracted for up to four years, with Service Categories rotated for bidding every three years. According to this schedule, no Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued in FY20. <p><i>Conclusion:</i> There was no RFP due for issue in FY20. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate communication by AAs to potential bidders specific to the grant award process.</p>	<p>Confirmation of communication by the AAs to potential bidders specific to the grant award process</p>	<p>Part A RFP issued in FY20 for FY21 contracts – Not applicable</p> <p>Courtesy Notice for Pre-Proposal Conference in FY20 for FY21 contracts – Not applicable</p>
<p>e) Does the REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS incorporate service category definitions that are consistent with those defined by the Planning Council?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the schedule mentioned above in d), no Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued in FY20 <p><i>Conclusion:</i> There was no RFP due for issue in FY20. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate communication by AAs to potential bidders specific to Planning Council products</p>	<p>Confirmation of communication by the AAs to potential bidders specific to PC products</p>	<p>Part A RFP issued in FY20 for FY21 contracts – Not applicable</p>
<p>f) At the end of the award process, were there still unobligated funds?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most recent procurement report produced on 05/26/21 shows that 100% of total service dollars for Part A and MAI were procured by the end of the contract period, including the addition of reconciliations and carry-over funds. <p><i>Conclusion:</i> There were no unobligated funds for the contract period.</p>	<p>Comparison of final amounts procured and total amounts allocated in each service category</p>	<p>FY20 Part A and MAI Procurement Report provided by the AA to the PC (05/26/2021)</p>

Section I: Procurement/Request for Proposals Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>g) At the end of the year, were there unspent funds? If so, in which service categories?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most recent FY20 procurement report produced on 05/26/2021 shows unspent service dollars as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Part A: \$4,690,574 in unspent service dollars with less than 95% of the amount procured expended in the following Service Categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Primary Care – Public Clinic – 33% expended ➤ Primary Care – CBO Targeted to White/MSM – 43% expended ➤ Primary Care – Women at Public Clinic – 54% expended ➤ Primary Care – Pediatric – 45% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Clinic Case Management – 83% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Public Clinic – 51% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to H/L – 60% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to Rural – 62% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to Veterans – 85% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to Youth – 90% expended ➤ LPAP – Public Clinic – 37% expended ➤ LPAP – Untargeted – 59% expended ➤ Outreach Services – 74% expended ➤ Service Linkage – Targeted to Youth – 72% expended ➤ Service Linkage – Targeted to Newly-Diagnosed/Not-in-Care – 67% expended ➤ Service Linkage – CBO in Pcare – 91% expended II. MAI: \$902,445 with less than 95% of the amount procured expended in the following Service Categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Primary Care – CBO Targeted to African American – 71% expended ➤ Primary Care – CBO Targeted to Hispanic – 53% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to African American – 72% expended ➤ Med. Case Management – Targeted to Hispanic – 59% expended • The total amount of unspent service funds for both Part A and MAI in FY20 was \$5,593,019 or 25.4% of the total service dollar allocation. <p><u>Conclusion:</u> There were \$5,593,019 in unspent funds in Part A and MAI. The Service Categories listed above had less than 95% of the amount procured expended in FY20. Unspent funds represented 25.4% of the total FY20 Part A and MAI allocation for service dollars. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of FY20 Part A service dollars and sixty-three percent (63%) of MAI service dollars were expended by the end of the fiscal year. The substantial percentage of unspent Part A service dollars was due to the impact of COVID-19 on health care delivery systems throughout the US in 2020. The Houston EMA was able to reallocate a significant portion of these unspent funds to the State ADAP Program, which is currently experiencing a \$52 million deficient.</p>	<p>Review of final spending amounts for each service category</p>	<p>FY20 Part A and MAI Procurement Report provided by the AA to the PC (05/26/2021)</p>

Section II: Reimbursement Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>h) Does the ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT have a method of communicating back to the Planning Council the results of the procurement process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (signed 3/1/12) between the CEO, Planning Council, AA, and Office of Support requires the AA to “inform the Council no later than the next scheduled [...] Steering Committee meeting of any allocation changes” (page 4). In addition, FY20 Part A and MAI procurement reports from the AA were agendaized for Planning Council meetings occurring on 08/06/2020, 09/10/2020, 11/12/2020, 04/08/2021, 06/10/2021. Results from the procurement process were also provided during the AA report. <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The AA was required to and maintained a method of communicating back to the Planning Council the results of the procurement process, including agendaized procurement reports to Committees and Full Council.</p>	<p>Confirmation of communication by the AAs to the PC specific to procurement results</p>	<p>Houston EMA MOU (signed 3/1/12)</p> <p>PC Agendas (08/06/2020, 09/10/2020, 11/12/2020, 04/08/2021, 06/10/2021)</p>
<p>i) What is the average number of days that elapsed between receipt of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice and the issuance of payment by the AA?</p> <p>What percent of contractors were paid by the AA after submission of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Within 20 days?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Within 35 days?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Within 50 days?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Annual Contractor Reimbursement Report (CER) Tracking Summary for FY20 produced by the AA on 06/25/21 showed an average of 21 days elapsing between receipt of an accurate CER from contracted agencies and the issuance of payment by the AA, compared to 28 days on average in FY19. 100% of contracted agencies were paid within an average of 21 days following the receipt of an accurate CER. In comparison, the AA paid 100% of contracted agencies within an average of 28 days in FY19. One contracted agency was paid within an average of 10 days, and 100% were paid within an average of 35 days. <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The average number of days elapsing between receipt of an accurate contractor reimbursement request for Part A and/or MAI funds and the issuance of payment by the AA was 21 days. The AA paid all contracted Part A and/or MAI agencies within an average of 35 days following receipt of an accurate invoice.</p>	<p>Time elapsed between receipt of an accurate contractor reimbursement request or invoice and the issuance of payment by the AA</p>	<p>FY20 Part A and MAI Contractor Reimbursement Report (CER) Tracking Summary (06/25/21)</p>

Section III: Contract Monitoring Process

Method of Measurement	Summary of Findings	Data Point	Data Source(s)
<p>j) Does the ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT use the Standards of Care as part of the contract monitoring process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typical RFP language states that the AA will monitor for compliance with the Standards of Care during site monitoring visits of contracted agencies. Directions to current Standards of Care document are also provided. As described in (d) above, however, the AA did not issue an RFP during the FY20 contract period. • In addition, the AA's Site Visit Guidelines used during the FY20 contract period includes the process for reviewing compliance with Standards of Care. • The AA's Quality Management Plan (dated 01/20) states that the RWGA Clinical Quality Improvement Project Coordinator and Quality Management Development Project Coordinator both "[conduct] onsite QM program monitoring of funded services to ensure compliance with RWGA Standards of Care and QM plan" (Page 6). The Plan also states that "Annual site visits are conducted by RWGA at all agencies to ensure compliance with the standards of care" (Page 9). <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The AA used the Standards of Care as part of the contract monitoring process and clearly indicated this in its quality management policies, procedures, and plans.</p>	<p>Confirmation of use of adopted SOC in contract monitoring activities</p>	<p>Part A RFP issued in FY20 for FY21 contracts – N/a</p> <p>HCPH/RWGA Policy and Procedures for Performing Ryan White Part A Site Visits (Revised 03/17)</p> <p>HCPH/RWGA Quality Management Plan (01/20)</p>