Boston EMA Ryan White HIV/AIDS Services Planning Council

ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISM

FY25 Final Report

July 2026

Services, Priorities and Evaluations Committee

Planning Council Support

1010 Massachusetts Avenue

Boston, MA 02118

www.bostonplanningcouncil.org

Table of Contents

Assessment of Administrative Mechanism

Background

The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) requires that all Ryan White Part A Planning Councils conduct an annual assessment of the administrative mechanism (AAM) to evaluate how efficiently and rapidly grantees disburse funding to the areas of greatest need within the eligible metropolitan area (EMA).

The AAM is an annual evaluation to assess the efficiency of the grantee, Boston Public Health Commission (BPHC) via the Ryan White Services team (RWS), in disbursing the Part A funds to the agencies contracted to provide Part A HIV services within the Boston EMA. Methodologies include distributing a survey to Part A providers and reviewing RWS's internal documentation.

The Boston EMA Ryan White HIV/AIDS Services Planning Council (hereby referred to as the Planning Council) has charged the Services, Priorities, and Evaluations Committee (SPEC) with this responsibility. SPEC develops or revises data collection tools, distributes them, provides input on the analysis of the results, and provides recommendations to RWS in areas where improvements are necessary. Planning Council Support (PCS) is responsible for revising the data collection tools according to SPEC's direction, distributing them, conducting data analysis, and presenting the analysis to the committee. SPEC develops its recommendations for a corrective action plan to address any issues that arise from the results and presents these recommendations to the Council for a vote. RWS responds to the recommendations with how they will implement the plan and address any concerns.

Methodology

From November 2025 to February 2026, SPEC members reviewed the AAM process and updated the previous year's data collection tools. The agency survey included 17 questions: 15 multiple choice and 2 open-ended. Majority of the multiple choice questions also provided space for elaboration or additional comments. The survey asked Part A-funded agencies to respond about the effectiveness of BPHC's disbursement of funds, including agency location and capacity, procurement, contracting and budgeting, and overall satisfaction with BPHC's administration of Part A funds. The survey was sent out via SurveyMonkey to contract management and/or fiscal staff at each Part A agency in February of 2026 with a due date of March 20th, 2026. The SPEC PCS Liaison was responsible for regular follow-up with Part A providers during the data collection period. Providers were also reminded to fill it out via communications and newsletters from RWS.

In response to the FY24 Assessment of Administrative Mechanism, SPEC requested quarterly fiscal updates utilizing the template typically created for the BPHC RWS Fiscal Data Request as part of the annual AAM. RWS reinstated these updates from the Director of Subrecipient Compliance or a representative thereof, during SPEC meetings regarding contracting, payments, and spending. These updates took place during SPEC meetings in November, January, and May of the 2025-2026 Planning Council term. There was an update originally scheduled for March, however, due to the close out of the fiscal year, there was no new data ready to present to the Committee. The final presentation in May included the data to be analyzed in conjunction with the agency survey. This BPHC RWS Fiscal Data Request included descriptive statistics for contracting, invoicing, and budget revisions. In addition, BPHC provided updates pertaining to the FY24 Response to the AAM in a presentation during May that was taken into consideration for the FY25 recommendations.

In March and April, PCS presented updates to SPEC regarding the AAM survey and BPHC Data Request. The presentation in March included the number of responses collected. In April, PCS presented the raw and aggregated results of the agency survey including further analysis. In May, BPHC presented their fiscal data, and SPEC discussed the results in depth to develop a corrective action plan for BPHC.

The final results and recommendations were presented to and approved by the Planning Council on May 14th, 2026. BPHC presented their response on June 25th, 2026.

Agency Survey Results

Respondent Demographics and General Information

There was a high response rate this year, with a total of 28 out of 32 or 87.5% of agencies responding during the data collection period. One respondent submitted their response in April after the deadline and analysis was complete, and therefore that respondent's submission is not included in this report. In addition, despite efforts to ensure only one person per agency responded, there is likely more than one respondent per agency for all counties except for Suffolk and there were no responses from Bristol or Strafford counties.

Table 1. What county is your agency in?

County	Number of Respondents
Bristol	0
Essex	2
Middlesex	4
Norfolk	1
Plymouth	2
Suffolk	10
Worcester	5
Hillsborough	2
Rockingham	1
Strafford	0
Total	27

Table 2. How long have you worked at your agency?

Years	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Less than 1 year	2	7.4%
1 - 5 years	3	11.1%
5 - 10 years	7	25.9%
Over 10 years	14	51.8%
No Response	1	3.7%
Total	27	100%

A little over half of respondents have worked at their agency for over 10 years (51.8%). In order to gauge staff capacity, respondents were then asked to select all the responsibilities they had pertaining to the Part A grant from the following choices:

- Fiscal Management (Budgeting, expenditures, fiscal compliance)
- Grant administration and/or oversight
- Client-facing services

- Data reporting and/or evaluation
- Program management and monitoring
- Other (please specify)

Table 3. In your role, which of the following responsibilities related to administering the Part A grant do you have? [Select all that apply]

Responsibility	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Fiscal management	19	70.4%
Grant administration and/or oversight	18	66.7%
Client-facing services	11	40.7%
Data reporting and/or evaluation	12	44.4%
Program management and monitoring	17	63.0%
Other (please specify)	0	0%
Total	27	100%

One person originally selected "Other (please specify)" and wrote in "Direct Care Staff", so during analysis this response was shifted to "Client-facing services". 70.4% of respondents indicated that they have two or more responsibilities related to the Part A grant. This data was used throughout analysis to gauge agency staff capacity.

Table 3a. Consolidated responses to the previous question

Number of Responsibilities	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
1 responsibility	8	29.6%
2 responsibilities	5	18.5%
3 responsibilities	3	11.1%
4 responsibilities	4	14.8%
5 responsibilities	7	25.9%
Total	27	100%

88.8% of respondents have six or more employees at their agency that work on the Ryan White Part A grant in some capacity, with only three respondents indicating they have 1-5 employees. Majority of respondents served 101-500 clients with Part A-funded services in the last year. In addition, all of those that responded "I am not sure" to number of clients served were responsible for Fiscal Management and/or Grant Administration and Oversight.

Table 4. Number of Clients Served with RW Part A by Program Size

Number of Clients Served with RW Part A	Number of Employees on the Part A grant			
	1 - 5 Employees	**6 - 10 Employees**	**Over 10 Employees**	**Total**
Less than 100 Clients	2	1		3
101-250 Clients		9	2	11
251 - 500 Clients		2	4	6
Over 500 Clients			2	2
I am not sure.	1		4	5
Total	**3**	**12**	**12**	**27**

The survey also asked how many service categories each respondent's agency was funded for in the last fiscal year (FY25). The majority of respondents were funded for 1-2 categories in FY25.

Table 5. How many service categories were you funding for in FY25?

Number of Categories	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
1 - 2 Categories	16	59.3%
3 - 4 Categories	5	18.5%
5 - 6 Categories	5	18.5%
Over 6 Categories	0	0%
I am not sure.	1	3.7%
Total	27	100.0%

For the remaining assessment questions, headers will denote the main theme of each question and open-ended comments will be included where applicable. Additional analysis by agency size or staff capacity will be done where SPEC deemed it was relevant.

Assessment Questions

Adequate Information Provided during the RFP

The next question asked respondents if **BPHC provided potential agencies with adequate information on applying for funding during the most recent Request for Proposal (RFP) cycle.** 74.1% of respondents agreed, 14.8% were neutral, and 11.1% disagreed. Of those, six respondents left comments noted below by agency size and response to this question:

Over 10 employees, Disagree – "Funding was cut due to staff on leave, which effected our staffing."

Over 10 employees, Disagree – "There was a lot of vague information back and forth with agency from contract manager and [Ryan White Services]"

6-10 employees, Disagree – "We were initially told the RFP would be released in April 2025. There was minimal communication that it would not be released in April 2025 but instead was not released until October 2025. This delay and lack of information caused us to experience delays in getting awarded programs up and running on a timely basis. This was a hinderance in our operational budget and planning because we didn't know what services would be funded and whether to hire staff."

Over 10 employees, Agree – "No issues that I am aware of"

Contract Finalization & Invoice Repayment

Respondents were asked how long it takes BPHC to finalize contracts with their agency, how long it typically takes BPHC to reimburse invoices upon submission of all required documents, and then offered space for respondents to provide reasons for reimbursement length. BPHC also provided this data in descriptive statistics for the full fiscal year for analysis.

SPEC notes that the target contract finalization time is 45 days and therefore, this next question was worded incorrectly. SPEC also notes that the question about invoices should have been invoice "repayment" not reimburse, so that edit is reflected below for clarity.

Table 6. In your experience, how long does it take BPHC to finalize contracts with your agency?

Number of employees	Number of days to finalize contracts					
	30 days or less	31-60 days	61-90 days	More than 90 days	I am not sure	Total
1 – 5 Employees			1	1	1	3
6 - 10 Employees		2	4	5	1	12
Over 10 Employees		3	4	3	2	12
I am not sure						0
Total	0	5	9	9	4	27

Smaller agencies (1-5 employees) waited the longest for their contracts to be finalized, with all responses falling in 61-90 days or more than 90 days. 66.7% of all respondents said more than 61 days.

Of the four that said "I am not sure" for length of time for contract finalization, two respondents have four or more responsibilities, one respondent is responsible for Client-Facing Services and Program Management and Monitoring, and the other is only responsible for Grant Administration and/or Oversight. It could be reasonably assumed that these responsibilities contribute to why these respondents are unsure of the length of time it takes BPHC to finalize their agency's contract.

Table 7. Upon submission of all your required documents, how long does it typically take BPHC to repay invoices?

Number of employees	Number of days to repay invoices			
	30 days or less	I am not sure	More than 30 days	Total
1 – 5 Employees	1	2		3
6 - 10 Employees	3	6	3	12
Over 10 Employees	4	6	2	12
I am not sure				0
Total	8	14	5	27

29.6% of respondents said that it typically takes BPHC 30 days or less to repay invoices, 51.9% said more than 30 days, and 18.5% were unsure. There does not appear to be a pattern depending on agency size. Repayment delays are experienced across all responsibility levels, including respondents with just 1 responsibility. Four out of five respondents who responded "I am not sure" about invoice repayment time hold four or more responsibilities related to the Part A grant and one is only responsible for Grant Administration and/or Oversight. Respondents with five responsibilities have the highest "I am not sure" rate, which could point to a communication gap that affects the most burdened staff the most, however, this survey cannot accurately describe the direction of the communication gap.

After those questions, respondents were asked if reimbursement took more than 30 days, to select the most common reasons from the following options:

- Incomplete or incorrect invoices submitted by my agency – 1 respondent selected this.
- Agency staff shortages or vacancies – No one selected this.
- Agency IT or system issues - No one selected this.
- Agency communication barriers – 1 respondent selected this.
- BPHC staffing shortages or vacancies – 5 respondents selected this
- BPHC IT or system issues – 1 respondent selected this.

- BPHC communication barriers – 5 respondents selected this.
- Or other – majority of people selected other, 65% or 13 respondents

Of those that selected “Other” -

- **8 people wrote only unknown or unsure**
- “It is hard to decipher on BPHC's end what were the barriers and why reimbursement took over 30 days”
- “A fiscal responsibility.”
- “unknown, no communication from BPHC on the delay but emails that they received the invoices when sent”
- “On BPHCs end, we don't know why”

One respondent that selected BPHC staffing shortages or vacancies AND communication barriers said:

- “BPHC staff do not respond timely to inquiries”

Only three respondents selected more than one option.

In comparison to the descriptive statistics provided by BPHC, 60% of invoices were paid in less than 30 days, 38% were paid in more than 30 days, and 3% of invoices were paid in exactly 30 days. The standard deviation is 17.04 days, the average number of days was 30 days, the minimum was 3 days, and the maximum was 148 days.

This demonstrates that the survey alone did not accurately capture invoice repayment data.

Resources & Documents

Next, the survey asked about resources and documents available to agencies to manage the grant, such as a Provider Handbook, the Expected Performance Measures, and Program & Reporting Requirements. 85% of respondents feel that the resources and documents they receive as recipients are adequate for managing the grant and 96% of respondents know where to locate these resources and referenced e2Boston or the BPHC website for access.

Four respondents that said “yes” that the resources/documents are adequate left comments expressing that they are helpful and informative.

- “Very informative”
- “Yes, the documents are clear and helpful. They explain what we need to do, how to report, and what is expected. They are enough to help us manage the Part A grant correctly.”
- “Manuals are very informative and helpful.”
- “Provides the policies and what is necessary for the program”

Three respondents that said “no” the resources/documents are not adequate left comments, related to delays in distribution of documents and about language being vague or interpreted differently by staff at different points in time.

- “Performance Measures were never sent out in over a year or more”
- “Besides the handbook always coming out several months into the grant year, BPHC staff will interpret it differently than written after the fact”
- “Some of the requirements for policies have vague language and does not provide a complete explanation for the information that is required to have no findings during a site visit.”

Ryan White Services Team Technical Assistance

RWS provides agencies with various types of technical assistance (TA) across the grant areas: Programmatic, Fiscal, and Quality Management (QM). The survey asked respondents to rate their experience with the TA from Excellent to Average to Poor. There was an option to select that they did not require TA.

Table 8.1 Programmatic TA

Excellent	Average	Poor	I did not require TA	**Total**
11	8	1	6	26

40.7% of respondents rated Programmatic TA excellent, 29.6% rated average, 3.7% or one person rated it poor, and 22.2% selected that they did not require TA. One person did not respond to this question.

Table 8.2 Budgeting and Contracting (Fiscal) TA

Excellent	Average	Poor	I did not require TA	**Total**
10	12	3	2	27

Budgeting and Contracting TA had the poorest ratings overall, but not as significant as compared to some of the qualitative data expressed so far: 37% rated excellent, 44.4% rated average, 11.1% rated poor, and 7.4% selected that they did not require TA.

Table 8.3 Quality Management TA

Excellent	Average	Poor	I did not require TA	**Total**
11	8	1	6	26

40.7% rated QM TA excellent, 22.2% rated average, 7.4% rated poor, and QM had the most people that did not need TA, with 29.6%. One person did not respond to this question.

Three respondents left positive comments on TA stating that RWS has excellent teamwork and have been very helpful.

- "Excellent team work" – This respondent rated all three TA categories excellent.
- "RWS Team has been very helpful in all aspects" – This respondent rated all three TA categories excellent.
- "Everything seems to run smooth" – This respondent rated Programmatic TA excellent, Fiscal TA average, and did not require QM TA.

Six respondents left more negative comments on TA regarding unclear communication and frustration with the Fiscal Team.

- "We asked for guidance multiple times on a particular topic. We did not receive clear information / any information on how to move forward. Then we were issued a finding for not having the answer / following regs for the topic BPHC couldn't guide us on. We were told by BPHC Fiscal no finding would be issued. However, BPHC Program Staff issued a finding." – This respondent did not require Programmatic or QM TA and rated Fiscal TA average.
- "Programmatic: Information was conveyed to contract manager; however, no response from QM. I do not work in Finance, so I am unsure about Budgeting/Fiscal. QM, never responded to all emails/contacts regarding Cultural Assessment" – This respondent rated Programmatic TA average, did not require Fiscal TA, and rated QM TA poor.

- “Finance staff seem poorly trained and seem to know nothing of basic or accepted accounting practices. Most of the time I feel like I am explaining basic systems and procedures to them instead of the reverse.” – This respondent did not require Programmatic TA, rated Fiscal TA poor, and QM TA average.
- “QM Team did not communicate after numerous attempts and specific requests for a response regarding the documents submitted” – This respondent rated Programmatic TA average, did not require Fiscal TA, and rated QM TA poor.
- “Site visit claimed documents were not provided though they were provided multiple times & were confirmed by BPHC programmatic staff that they were received, fiscal staff also claimed regulations stated a requirement that they did not (regulation has not changed since 2017 & this dispute was settled with BPHC back in 2019, but BPHC fiscal staff are claiming that is not sufficient because it was from 2019, though the regulation has not changed)” – This respondent rated Programmatic TA excellent, Fiscal TA poor, and did not require QM TA.
- “TA requested. A meeting was scheduled to discussed the problem, our suggested solution. It took months to get a yes or no to our suggested solution.” – This respondent rated Programmatic TA poor, Fiscal TA excellent, and did not require QM TA.

Overall Communication and Satisfaction with the RWS Team

The last few questions are generally about overall satisfaction with communication and working with BPHC. When asked to rate communication between their agency and BPHC, 59.2% of respondents said excellent, 29.6% said average, and 14.8% said poor.

Table 9. Satisfaction with RWS Team Communication by Number of Employees

Number of Employees on the RW Part A Grant	**Rating of RWS Team Communication**			
	Excellent	Average	Poor	**Total**
1 – 5 Employees	1	2		3
6 – 10 Employees	7	1	4	12
Over 10 Employees	7	5		12
I am not sure.				0
Total	15	8	4	27

10 respondents left comments:

Three respondents who rated it Excellent left comments talking about the availability of assistance, responsiveness, and appreciating monthly calls:

- “Very clear, there is always someone available to help.”
- “Monthly calls are helpful and beneficial to our program.”
- “[RWS Contract Manager] is great, very responsive and willing to meet with questions.”

Three respondents who rated it Average also left comments, expressing that asking for TA feels punitive and that multiple follow-ups have been needed to get email responses.:

- “Average based on site visit finding experience detailed [in a previous question]. Otherwise, excellent.”
- “It feels punitive when asking for TA assistance.”
- “They answer emails if I follow up multiple times.”

All four respondents who rated it Poor left comments expressing that communication is challenging, specifically with fiscal and QM staff, and describing communication during site visits as harsh, disrespectful, and unclear.:

- "We have a new program coordinator and communication is often challenging."
- "BPHC Fiscal and QM Staff do not respond to emails on a timely basis and sometimes not at all."
- "With programmatic staff, it is excellent; fiscal staff, it is horrible."
- "Monthly meetings are usually 3 minutes long. Communication during site visits is harsh and does not recognize or appreciate the hard work people are doing. It focuses too much on the negative. Communication is received as disrespectful with unclear expectations. We have no problem doing what you want, but you need to be clear and concise about it."

Table 10. Overall Satisfaction with BPHC's Administration of Part A by Number of Employees

Number of Employees on the RW Part A Grant	**Satisfaction with BPHC's Administration of Part A**		
	Yes	No	**Total**
1 – 5 Employees	2	1	3
6 – 10 Employees	8	4	12
Over 10 Employees	12		12
I am not sure.			0
Total	22	5	27

Of those that responded that they were satisfied, seven respondents left comments:

- "More funds for case managers"
- "Another staff answer to this question"
- "Yes. I am satisfied with BPHC's administration of Part A funds. They manage the program well and provide good support."
- "Funds are helping our client's social needs."
- "Yes, I am satisfied."
- "No issues that I am made aware of from my fiscal team"
- "Overall I am satisfied but there is not a clear way to request funds if needed as we get closer to the end of the fiscal year."

Four that responded that they were *not* satisfied left comments:

- "There is lots of room for improvement especially when it comes to fiscal."
- "Individually the finance team at BPHC are very nice and hard working but as a team they need a lot of training."
- "It is quite hypocritical for the BPHC team to mandate immediate responses to their requests for information but not respond timely or at all to multiple requests from us for information. Not only is this frustrating, it causes delays in delivering services to our clients."
- "Contracts are always late, PO & activity are always late, payment is delayed and constant demands that put an undue burden on staff that are not required by federal or state regulations (and some that are directly against state regulations)."

Changes Needed in the Administration of Part A Funds

The second to last question asked respondents to share if they felt any changes were needed in the administration of Part A funds. 21 respondents answered this question, six did not. Including those six, 13 respondents either did not add any comments, responded "not really" or "no changes needed", or "N/A". One respondent said: "At this time, no major changes are needed in the administration of Part A funds, as the current processes are effective and well managed. The transparency, clear communication and support help meet our client needs efficiently and equitably."

The most common theme was more efficient grant communication and contract execution, with five responses:

- "Fully executed contract sooner in the fiscal year."
- "Yes. It would be good if contracts could be finished faster. This would help agencies plan and manage our work better."
- "It would be great if we were notified of awards, budget revisions, policy needs, etc in a timelier manner."
- "Increase the indirect rate for administrative cost, because it no longer covers basic overhead costs for the agency."
- "Getting fully executed contracts in a more timely manner"

Another major theme was around fiscal staff training, support, or responsibilities, with four responses:

- "BPHC Fiscal Staff s/b responsible for assessing / reviewing / judging Agency's Fiscal performance."
- "Need more and better trained fiscal staff. The staff I interact with are very nice and mean well but have not been well trained."
- "The fiscal staff need to go to a federal grant management boot camp."
- "Fiscal Team needs support. Budget revisions take very long to review, process, and approve."

The last major theme was around the availability and use of funds or staffing vacancies, with three:

- "The way FTE are calculated"
- "It would be helpful to be able to request additional funds or to be able to move funds from one funded service to another especially if there is a vacancy. There is no way to do this and unless the funds are swept from the contract, the funds go unused."
- "We need more case managers"

Lastly, one respondent left a suggestion of how to structure feedback collected via the AAM:

- "Please see our comments! This is more of an in-person conversation that BPHC should have with its grantees. Grantees should be able to have a forum similar to the agency site visits to express frustrations and work toward viable solutions for both the grantees and BPHC. We feel like we are viewed by BPHC Staff not as partners in delivering services to clients in the EMA but rather subordinates that must follow BPHC's dictates without any say in how administration of the grant should best work."

Additional Feedback for the RWS Team

The final question asked if respondents had any other feedback that they would like to share about their experience working with RWS. 18 respondents answered this question, nine did not. Including those nine, 14 respondents did not leave comments, said "no feedback at this time", or wrote "N/A". One respondent, who commented about increasing the indirect rate for administrative costs, said "See answers above".

There were seven positive comments regarding the respondents' work with the RWS team:

- "We enjoy working with the BPHC team!"
- "Our BPHC leadership team is amazing and very organized and communicative."
- "Working with BPHC's Ryan White Services Team has been a very positive experience. The team is consistently supportive, responsive, and truly committed to patient-centered care. Their

collaboration and dedication make it easier to deliver high-quality services and achieve meaningful outcomes for the clients we serve."

- "They are very professional"
- "They are a very dedicated hard-working team"
- "They have excellent teamwork and are always available to answer any questions. They are helpful and supportive."
- "With recent transition of [agency] staff, the RWS Team has worked very collaborative during this time. The responsiveness and assistance have made an immense impact on the CARE Program by creating a solid foundation. Moving forward we feel more confident on reaching successes."

A few respondents commented about mismatched site visit expectations and recommendations:

- "It would be beneficial that the same expectation BPHC has for their subrecipients, that they hold themselves to the same expectations and standards."
- "The site visit process should be more objective. It seems that if there is any turnover in BPHC staff from one site visit to the next, what was approved by at a previous site visit by a previous staff person, results in a citation from the new staff person. There also should be a viable appeal process for contesting citations."
- "During site visits, we understand that findings, observations, and recommendations are part of the process. After each visit, our team works diligently to address all items identified in those categories. It would be extremely helpful if site visit requirements could be incorporated into the monthly check-ins. This would allow us to stay aligned and ensure expectations are met throughout the year. When these requirements are not discussed until the next site visit, it can feel discouraging, especially after significant effort has been put into resolving previous issues, only to learn that we still haven't met your needs. This has had a noticeable impact on team morale and their willingness to engage positively. We truly value the partnership and want to work collaboratively to meet your expectations, so regular communication on these requirements would make a big difference. Additionally, it is clear that our main point of contact is given instructions to provide us with action items but often lacks clarity on the specifics of the ask. When we follow up with questions, there is limited information available, and they need to go back to the Part A team for clarification. This back-and-forth significantly reduces the time we have to complete the tasks. We frequently receive numerous assignments without clear instructions, which makes it challenging to meet expectations efficiently. Improved clarity and timely communication would help us work more effectively and strengthen our collaboration."

One respondent mentioned a disagreement about a data request:

- "There have also been times that BPHC staff have asked for patient data that is outside the scope of the grant and this has been an ongoing disagreement."

One respondent suggested that BPHC digitize their invoicing system:

- "Digitize the invoicing"

Additional Qualitative Data Analysis

PCS and the Committee analyzed the qualitative/open response data across all questions and pulled out 5 main themes that were referenced at least once:

- Satisfaction working with BPHC
- Comments on or about funding – such as needing more funding, unclear on how to get more, etc.
- Issues with the fiscal staff or fiscal processing
- Unclear communication regarding expectations, regulations, site visit findings, etc.

- Lack of timeliness – especially related to the contracting process was noted multiple times

Overall trends are noted on the tables below per program size, however, there did not appear to be significant trends depending on program size and qualitative themes were felt across a variety of programs. The columns are the counts of each main qualitative theme – for the first table, across all open response questions, each respondent only talked about that theme. For the second table, each respondent talked about multiple theme, grouped by frequency. The mentions of each theme are then identified by number of employees at that respondents' agency – in the rows.

Table 11. Main Qualitative Themes across the Agency Survey by Program Size

Program Size	**Main Qualitative Themes (if only one theme was noted)**					
	No Data	Satisfied working w/ BPHC	Comments on funding	Issues with fiscal staff /processes	Unclear communication	Lack of timeliness
1 - 5 Employees	1			1		
6 - 10 Employees	1	2	1	2	1	1
Over 10 Employees	3	4	2		2	
Total	5	6	3	3	3	1

Program Size	**Main Qualitative Themes – multiple noted**			
	Satisfied but acknowledge lack of timeliness	Comments on funding; Issues with fiscal staff/processes	Unclear communication; Lack of timeliness; Issues with fiscal staff /processes	**Total** (across all themes)
1 - 5 Employees	1			3
6 - 10 Employees	1	1	2	12
Over 10 Employees	1			12
Total	3	1	2	27

Overall, nine respondents are satisfied with BPHC, six being completely satisfied or not mentioning anything negative and three being satisfied but mentioning the lack of timeliness. This is across all agency sizes.

Six respondents discussed issues with fiscal staff or processes with majority of comments referring to the need for fiscal staff training, all of whom work at agencies with either 1-5 employees or 6-10 employees. This seems to be less of an issue with larger agencies.

Six respondents discussed issues of lack of timeliness with four comments explicitly about executing contracts faster. These comments were from majority respondents who worked at agencies with 6-10 employees.

Six respondents discussed issues of lack of timeliness with four comments explicitly about executing contracts faster. These comments were from majority respondents who worked at agencies with 6-10 employees.

BPHC RWS Fiscal Data Request

FY25 Data

As this data was reported on quarterly during the term due to a request from the FY24 AAM, SPEC considered the final quarter of this data request the submission for the FY25 AAM. This data was presented to the Committee on May 7th, 2026, along with updates pertaining to the other components FY24 Response to the AAM and taken into consideration for the Committee's final recommendations.

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for Invoice Payment in FY25 [Data pulled on May 6, 2026]

Sample Size	842 invoices
Invoices approved for payment	828 invoices
Invoices paid	813 invoices
Min/Max	3 days / 148 days
Standard Deviation	17.04
Average	30 days

On average, it took 30 days to pay invoices in FY25. The minimum number of days was three, and the maximum number of days was 148.

Table 12.1 Number of Days for Payment

Less than 30 days	485	59.7%
More than 30 days	306	37.6%
30 days exactly	21	2.7%

Almost 60% of invoices were paid in less than 30 days, 37.6% of invoices were paid in over 30 days, and 2.7% of invoices were paid in exactly 30 days.

Updates on the FY24 Activities

In order to take into consideration longer term goals and efforts being made by RWS, SPEC took into consideration RWS's progress on the FY24 AAM recommendations when analyzing the FY25 AAM results and developing the recommendations.
RWS developed a four-pronged approach to SPEC's recommendation from FY24:

- Leverage monthly monitoring to conduct real time TA with the subrecipient and RWS fiscal staff
- Provide and create additional training to increase subrecipient capacity
- Conduct quality improvement to reduce invoicing time
- Provide quarterly updates on fiscal process timelines to the Committee which were: Invoice, Contract, and Budget Revisions

In order to leverage monthly monitoring to conduct real time TA, RWS Fiscal Coordinators attended monthly monitoring calls with the subrecipients. Each attended six nonconsecutive calls in FY25. As this was a new administrative responsibility, occasional scheduling conflicts contributed to a lower attendance that intended. In instances where Fiscal Coordinators were unable to attend monitoring calls, the Program Coordinators/Contract Managers were able to ask more in-depth inquiries regarding fiscal management for supportive communication. With the additional exposure, RWS reported an increase in availability for TA for subrecipients and four of them received regular TA sessions specifically on invoicing.

To increase subrecipient capacity, RWS created a webinar series covering legislation, allowable costs, carryover, sweeps, spending letters, budgets, invoicing and the annual site visit. This was recorded in May of 2026 and posted to the website. There is a pre and posttest to accompany the webinar series for subrecipients to gauge learning.

RWS has also supported quality assurance, and quality improvement checks on invoices as they move through the invoicing payment system. RWS named that there was turnover in the position responsible for this project and thus a gap midway through the year but due to hiring two temporary staff, this quality improvement has resumed. The RWS fiscal team has also attended weekly to monthly meetings, as needed, with BPHC's Commission-wide finance team to identify areas of bidirectional improvement. RWS reported that this partnership has been effective, as they have actionable and specific items in which they correct in real time.

Lastly, RWS provided fiscal processing updates at three out of four requested SPEC meetings. The fourth presentation was canceled as there were no significant updates from the previous presentation.

Areas of Growth

In order for SPEC to understand the ongoing efforts, RWS also presented them with areas of growth in categories such as invoicing, contracting, and additional next steps.

Invoicing

RWS plans to improve consistency with training subrecipients on the most updated invoicing policy, and this was discussed at the FY26 Annual Provider Meeting. They plan to continue to meet more frequently with BPHC's Finance team to ensure widespread adherence.

Contracting

Contracting was named as an area of growth due to the wide range of experiences. RWS continues to advocate for an online automated system with BPHC's Finance team, and they are exploring those options. RWS has also minimized areas of congestion to increase efficiency. For example, for the FY26 contract they removed the scopes, budgets, narratives, and other areas that often go through several rounds of revisions to ensure they can open a Purchase Order as soon as possible. All FY26 contracts were executed within 45 days and subrecipients were able to begin billing sooner.

Additional Next Steps

RWS plans to increase meeting internally and with subrecipients to troubleshoot invoicing issues. They also aim to minimize burden by automating templates as much as possible. For example, in FY26, the invoicing template has additional validations and drop downs to minimize mistakes in the areas that occur consistently. In combination with the additional training, these efforts should support the subrecipient's internal capacity to ensure an invoice is submitted correctly the first time and thus paid within the appropriate timeline.

SPEC's Recommendations

During analysis, SPEC members acknowledged the continued infrastructure issues of administrative burden, miscommunication, and slow processing times for administration of the Ryan White Part A grant. They also acknowledged the ongoing efforts and measurable achievements made by the RWS team to address ongoing concerns that arise during the AAM annually. They recognized that FY25 was the first year following an RFP cycle and there were additional changes in the overall funding environment, including an abundance of carryover dollars to both Part A and EHE portfolios for BPHC staff. Even with this context, similar concerns remain that have been discussed in prior years, and SPEC maintains that these are important to address.

In the new term, SPEC's recommendations are as follows:

- Continue to present quarterly fiscal processing data (descriptive statistics) to SPEC but use the standard template for each presentation so that the Committee is able to track changes over time.
- In addition to quarterly descriptive statistics, RWS should include data on the average number of times invoices are being returned to an agency, present the predominant reasons for these returns, or maintain a tracker of types of delays.
- Provide regular updates on fiscal capacity building activities over the course of the next year.

PCS also stated that they will work with Council, SPEC leadership, and RWS to increase transparency and embed more administrative and fiscal capacity building updates into the regular Planning Council meeting cycle in the next year.

This was presented to the Planning Council and approved by a vote on May 14th, 2026.

BPHC Ryan White Services Response

RWS's response to SPEC's Corrective Action Plan as a result of the AAM to improve fiscal transparency in FY26 was presented to the Planning Council on June 25th, 2026, by Melanie Lopez, Director of Client Services, and Rebecca Ritterman, Senior Program Coordinator.

RWS first reviewed their progress on the FY25 Corrective Action Plan. In response to last year's recommendations, RWS reported the following:

- For monthly monitoring, fiscal coordinators participated in monthly calls as needed and held additional technical assistance sessions in areas of confusion.
- For subrecipient training, RWS created a six-part webinar training series to support subrecipient learning.
- For SPEC quarterly updates, RWS presented three times, in November, January, and May.
- For fiscal processing quality improvement, RWS received HRSA approval for a new invoice policy, held biweekly meetings with Finance, Grants, and Procurement staff, and conducted senior fiscal manager quality assurance checks.

In direct response to SPEC's recommendations for FY26, RWS will implement the following changes:

- RWS commits to continuing quarterly presentations to SPEC, including confirming when there are no major updates to share.

- RWS will use a standard template to track fiscal processing timelines and will add new data elements to the invoice tracking process, including the date an invoice is received, the date it is returned to a subrecipient for corrections (and the corrected return date), the date it is sent to Accounts Payable for review, the date AP returns it for corrections (and the corrected return date), the date it is approved for payment, and the final payment date. These new elements are intended to provide greater visibility into where and why delays occur in the invoicing process.
- RWS has implemented a shared tracker with Accounts Payable and Grants staff to identify and resolve invoice issues more quickly.
- In response to SPEC's recommendation to provide regular updates on fiscal capacity building, RWS will include an update on internal and external capacity-building efforts as part of each quarterly spending and utilization update, including the number of technical assistance sessions held, the fiscal processing topics discussed, and data analytics from the webinar training series.