Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board

Grants Reporting Information Project

GRIP

June 2013

Table of Contents

Overview of the Grants Reporting Information Project

The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board (Recovery Board) was established to oversee the effective implementation of the transparency and accountability requirements outlined in Title XV of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA or Recovery Act). In fulfilling this mandate, the Recovery Board successfully implemented a government-wide, centralized ARRA recipient reporting system called FederalReporting.gov. Recipients report on their ARRA funded projects through this centralized electronic collection system. FederalReporting.gov is based on fundamental principles: a limited set of data elements, data standards, and scalability to accommodate the number of recipient reports.

Reporting is Key for Accountability

Recipient reporting is a central component to federal financial assistance oversight as it shows how funds are spent and used and ensures that recipients are accountable for the money they have received. Through recipient reporting, the government and public can determine whether or not the program is meeting its goals and objectives.

However, effective oversight may be impacted by agency and program-specific reporting requirements, cited in the Codification of Governmentwide Grants Requirements (common rules) and in the terms and conditions of each award. In addition, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance has set forth multiple reporting schedules. For example, OMB Circular A-110,"Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations," requires performance reporting occur not more frequently than quarterly or less frequently than annually.

Project Description

In 2012, Recovery Board staff tested the feasibility of using FederalReporting.gov as a model for collecting financial reports on non-ARRA grant programs. This project was initiated based in large part upon feedback from ARRA recipients, who also receive non-ARRA awards from the federal government that reporting was not consistent across programs and data elements collected did not have standard definitions or formats. The reporting requirements, systems, and data formats are disparate within each agency's established business processes. The incongruent nature of federal grant reporting leads to duplicative systems, data inconsistencies, and administrative burdens for recipients and agencies.

Recovery Board staff initiated the Grant Reporting Information Project (GRIP) using the FederalReporting.gov system as a platform. FederalReporting.gov is the centralized government-wide collection system for federal agencies and recipients of federal awards under Section 1512 of the Recovery Act. GRIP was conducted as a proof-of-concept with a limited size and scope.

Nine federal grant recipients volunteered to participate in GRIP and collectively reported on 25 grants from 11 agencies. Two federal agencies participated in reviewing the collected data. GRIP captured data elements from OMB's Federal Financial Report (FFR), Standard Form 425 (SF-425), the financial

report for grants, as well as sub-recipient and vendor expense data collected in Recovery Act reporting. Appendix 1 documents the complete GRIP methodology, Appendix 1.1 contains the FFR/SF-425, and Appendix 1.2 lists participating recipients and grants reported.

GRIP's objectives were to test the following:

1. Can FederalReporting.gov be used to centrally collect federal grant financial reporting data?
2. Can centralized reporting reduce reporting burden?
3. Can providing a machine readable filing mechanism increase efficiencies?
4. Can federal grant reporting data be pre-populated by other government systems?
5. Can the Recovery Board's proposed Universal Award Identifier (UAID) algorithm be implemented within the system?

GRIP results demonstrated that:

1. Central grant financial reporting can be accomplished.
2. Comments from recipient participants support that some level of burden reduction could be achieved by submitting reports to one central source, using standard data, transmitting data in a standard format, and uploading multiple reports in one machine readable file. The project did not, however, measure burden reduction as compared to the Paperwork Burden Statement baseline, as defined by OMB, for the FFR/SF-425[1]. Burden reduction was not quantified because of the limited number of recipient participants and project timeframe, the current disparate nature of federal grant financial reporting requirements, and the learning curve associated with GRIP as a reporting system. A burden reduction test could be conducted in a broader pilot project using the FFR/SF-425 public reporting burden average as a baseline. It is important to note two recipient participants stated that centralized reporting, in combination with the adoption of financial reporting data standards and standardized business processes, will reduce burden and improve efficiencies only if implemented across the federal government.
3. The ability to produce standard machine readable report files (e.g., XML[2]) and to "bulk" or "batch" multiple grant reports in one XML file, regardless of agency or program, can significantly increase reporting efficiency.
4. Data pre-population can occur with federal systems that can be easily mapped and have reliable data. A government-wide award number standard would greatly improve the ability to match data for pre-population use in grant reporting. The benefits of a standard award identifier, which theoretically would be established at the inception of the award and carried throughout its life, are system edits that could be developed and implemented to test for valid numbers, reconciliation between systems and documents would be simplified, and changes to the number would be prevented.

---

[1] Per OMB SF-425 - Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.
[2] Extensible Markup Language (XML) - XML defines a set of rules for encoding documents to transport and store data. Its primary purpose is to support data exchange and is a free open standard.

5. An algorithm, easily identified by the awarding agency and recipients, can be used to produce a unique award identifier (UAID) using commonly available, as well as machine generated data elements (e.g., agency code, fiscal year, an alpha character indicating award type, and randomly generated alpha-numeric characters).

Findings

Can FederalReporting.gov be used to centrally collect federal grant financial reporting data?

Currently, the method by which grant recipients file financial reports varies across agencies and programs within the agencies. GRIP recipient participants stated that in some cases the FFR/SF-425 is entered directly into sophisticated agency systems (e.g., Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)/National Institutes of Health) while others require the information be submitted via adobe acrobat.pdf format or as excel spreadsheets. One recipient participant indicated that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is one example of an agency that has an electronic system but also requires the same information be submitted in paper format. In many cases, agencies receive data in paper format or as an adobe acrobat .pdf and then enter information manually into a grant program-specific database; such is the case at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA).

GRIP results clearly indicated a centralized grant financial reporting system can be built using the FederalReporting.gov technology. The system was easily modified to accommodate the federal grant financial reporting data currently collected in the Federal Financial Report (FFR/SF-425). Recipient participants who reported via web form found it easy to use. The ability to choose from multiple reporting mechanisms (e.g., webform, XML single submission, and XML bulk submission) made using the system desirable. GRIP recipient participants indicated that centralized reporting would eliminate the need to learn and keep track of the multiple grant financial reporting vehicles and various program-specific requirements currently in place throughout the federal government.

From an agency perspective, the NIFA grant administration office indicated a centralized reporting system for the FFR/SF-425 would finally allow them to collect SF-425 data electronically rather than on paper. They also indicated that if the centrally collected data were available for public queries, it would eliminate the time they currently spend creating stakeholder requested reports.

A government-wide centralized reporting mechanism would eliminate agency duplication of efforts, including development and maintenance of systems, help desk support, and data entry (e.g., paper forms submitted to agencies are then entered into agency systems by agency personnel). In addition, any mandated changes to standard data elements or other reporting requirements would occur once, ensuring a quick and truly government-wide implementation.

Can centralized reporting reduce reporting burden?

The results regarding reporting burden were inconclusive due to a couple of complicating factors, which lead to the inability to collect empirical data. First, GRIP data elements contained both FFR/SF-425

requirements as well as ARRA sub-recipient and vendor expense reporting requirements. A time test could not be conducted comparing recipient participants' current FFR/SF-425 submission methodologies to those employed during GRIP.

Second, grant reporting requirements (data and frequency) are not standard across the federal government. Although OMB directed that older grant financial report forms be replaced with the FFR/SF-425, effective government-wide October 1, 2009, pursuant to the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-107), this has not been consistently implemented. For example, one participant stated that within USDA's Agricultural Research Service, grant financial reporting requirements can be different depending on which office issues the award (e.g., similar awards require different reports). Also, agencies that do require an FFR/SF-425 often exempt grant recipients from having to submit certain data elements (e.g., indirect costs) depending upon the grant or program. Finally, recipient participants indicated that financial reporting varies across agencies and programs, with the reporting cycles ranging from quarterly, to semi-annually, annually, biennially, and some only at award closeout. One recipient participant indicated and others reiterated:

> "Reporting period is based on agency requirements. Less than 50 percent [of our grants] have financial and program reporting requirements in sync/due at the same time."

Additionally, recipient participants were asked to comment on whether it would ultimately take less time to file grant financial reports if data element requirements were standard across all grants. Recipient participants generally agreed if a government-wide financial reporting standard was implemented with one format and one set of data elements (e.g., no additional specific program level requirements) a level of burden reduction could be achieved. However, the amount of burden reduction would depend on the standardization of data and processes, and the frequency of reporting. Although recipient participants answered survey questions addressing burden reduction as it related to time and effort, it was subjective information based upon their experiences.

Can providing a machine readable filing mechanism increase efficiencies?

GRIP provided several report filing mechanisms, including the ability to create and submit a machine readable XML file. Recipient participants agreed the ability to submit XML files would increase efficiency because much, if not all, of the report data could be queried and generated through automated systems, reducing the amount of manual effort necessary. One recipient participant estimated that submitting a FFR/SF-425 via web form instead of the paper forms and excel spreadsheets currently required could reduce submission time by 10%. Recipient participants stated the ability to "batch" or "bulk" submit many financial reports (regardless of agency or program) in one XML file would significantly increase efficiency and ultimately reduce burden. As stated by one of the recipient participants:

> "If [GRIP] were moved into production, efficiencies would be realized in the standardization of the reporting process and the ability to submit many reports at once."

Can federal grant reporting data be pre-populated by other government systems?

GRIP used data from USASpending.gov[3] and the System for Award Management (SAM)[4], two government-wide systems that capture award information, to pre-populate some of the reporting fields. Data populated from USASpending.gov (agency information, Treasury Account Symbol, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number, funding amount, project title, award date and grant period) were tied to the grant award number being reported. Data populated from SAM (recipient name and address) were tied to the recipient's Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number, which government business partners are required to have. Manual searches by recipients and the GRIP support team were necessary in order to locate the proper grants in USASpending.gov due to award number formatting inconsistencies. In addition, some of the data being used for pre-population, such as the CFDA number funding amount, were missing, inaccurate, or incomplete in USASpending.gov.

The identified anomalies and errors can be attributed at least in part to the voluntary and highly manual data quality process followed in USASpending.gov. The Data Submission and Verification Tool, per the USASpending.gov website, is an optional tool not used for all data feeds. Further, once a user reports a data problem, the user is directed back to the agency to address the problem. Subsequently, the agency must resend the data. All of these manual processes make it extremely difficult to ensure accurate data. Implementing a robust automated data quality system similar to that employed by Recovery Board staff in FederalReporting.gov would significantly improve the reliability of USASpending.gov data, making data pre-population achievable as a means to realize grant financial reporting efficiencies.

Similar problems were not experienced when pre-populating information from SAM.

Can the Recovery Board's proposed Universal Award Identifier (UAID) algorithm be implemented within the system?

Currently, there is no standard government-wide grant award identifier format. Program offices use their own formulas to generate award numbers, and several change the award identifier throughout its life cycle by either adding alpha-numeric characters or truncating the identifier's prefix or suffix. Recovery Board staff documented reconciliation problems due to lack of standardization and researched the applicability and methodology by which a government-wide unique award identifier (UAID) could be established. The Recovery Board's previous experiences were substantiated during the GRIP test when difficulties arose reconciling recipient participant reported grant identification numbers with those contained in USASpending.gov. In most cases, the numbers did not match due to differences in the alpha-numeric characters themselves or the way in which the identifier was formatted.

As part of GRIP, Recovery Board staff tested the ability to create a machine generated 12 digit award number for each of the GRIP reported grants using the Board's proposed UAID algorithm. The algorithm

---

[3] USASpending.gov is mandated by the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (Transparency Act), managed by the General Services Administration, to provide the public with information about how their tax dollars are spent.

[4] SAM, managed by the General Services Administration, is the combination of federal procurement systems, including the Central Contractor Registry, with the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

created a machine generated 12 digit award number after each grant report was submitted. The UAID attributes consisted of the following:

- Agency Code: 3 digits (e.g., 012)
- Award Type: 1 digit (e.g., G for grant)
- Fiscal Year: 2 digits (e.g., 12)
- Random Alpha Numeric Code: 5 digits (e.g., 55EFG)
- Check Digit: 1 digit (e.g., 2)

The UAID test provided the project team the ability to access grant data using the UAID or the agency assigned award number. The UAID test proved that a specified format, which generated a random number from an algorithm, could be set up electronically and added to an existing user's system. Appendix 2 is a chart containing the award number as reported by recipient participant, the corresponding number from USASpending.gov, and the UAID as generated by GRIP.

Recommendations

The Recovery Board makes the following recommendations it believes would enhance federal grant financial reporting processes, reduce grant reporting burden, and improve data quality throughout the grant life cycle:

1. An adoption of financial reporting data standards and standardized business processes will reduce burden and improve efficiencies if implemented across the federal government.

2. A centralized financial reporting system should allow for multiple electronic reporting mechanisms with an emphasis on bulk or batch XML filing.

3. A unique award numbering scheme should be considered for government-wide implementation. This, along with more stringent data quality assurance measures within USASpending.gov, could enable seamless pre-population of some reporting data fields.

4. A full centralized reporting pilot should be conducted using standard data elements that could be used government-wide (e.g., FFR/SF-425). The pilot should use a standardized financial reporting frequency, and include a thorough time and resource evaluation to more adequately measure burden reduction. If the pilot is successful, centralized reporting should be used government-wide.

Scope

The Grant Reporting Information Project (GRIP) team reviewed the data dictionaries for the FederalReporting.gov American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)[1] reporting system, the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA)[2] Sub Award Reporting System (FSRS)[3], the FAADS+ USASpending.gov[4] agency file submission on financial assistance reporting, and the data fields for the Office of Management and Budget standard form 425 and 425-A, the Federal Financial Report (FFR/SF-425)[5]. After analyzing all data dictionaries and forms to identify duplicative and corresponding data requirements, data elements were selected for the GRIP proof-of-concept.

The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board's FederalReporting.gov collection system was used to build the GRIP test system. All of the data fields from the FFR/SF-425, a copy of which can be found in Attachment 1.1, were included as were the ARRA financial expense data elements as they pertained to sub recipients and vendors.

GRIP was launched in October 2012. We required that recipient reporting be completed in early November 2012. Agency data review occurred in December 2012.

Participant Selection and Grants Reported

In total, GRIP involved nine recipients and two agency participants.[6] Five recipient participants reported directly to GRIP: the State of Nebraska; University of Wisconsin-Madison; University of Washington; Colorado State University; and the University of New Mexico. The City of Bowie, MD; the College of Lake County, IL; the University of North Carolina-Wilmington and North Carolina State reported into the GRIP system using files in a standard machine language (Extensible Markup Language (XML)) generated by grant middleware software that they had previously implemented at their institutions.

---

[1] FederalReporting.gov is the central government-wide data collection system for Federal Agencies and Recipients of Federal awards under Section 1512 of the Recovery Act.

[2] The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) was signed on September 26, 2006. The intent is to empower every American with the ability to hold the government accountable for each spending decision.

[3] The FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) is the reporting tool Federal prime awardees (i.e. prime contractors and prime grants recipients) use to capture and report subaward and executive compensation data regarding their first-tier subawards to meet the FFATA reporting requirements.

[4] The FFATA legislation requires information on federal awards (federal financial assistance and expenditures) be made available to the public via a single, searchable website, which is www.USASpending.gov.

[5] The FFR/SF-425 replaced older grant financial report, forms pursuant to the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-107), effective government-wide October 1, 2009.

[6] One of the agency participants, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), recommended one of the recipient participants, the State of Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality; it also recommended coordination with the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP). The FDP is a cooperative initiative among 10 federal agencies and 119 institutional recipients of federal funds that is a program sponsored by the Government, University, and Industry Research Roundtable of the National Academies. Its purpose is to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants and contracts and it works cooperatively with federal agencies on specific projects to address these issues. The FDP created a work group and four members participated. The remaining participants were recommended through the GRIP project team.

GRIP did not replace the recipients' normal reporting requirements, rather the recipients agreed to participate for GRIP testing purposes only. Each of the nine recipient participants selected up to five grants to report. Together, the nine recipient participants reported on 25 grants from 11 different agencies; Appendix 1.2 lists the grants and associated information for each of the recipients.

Data Collection Strategy

Recipient participants provided the grant award identification number, agency name, program, catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number, recipient Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number, and any sub-recipient names and DUNS numbers for each of the grants they selected for the test. Based upon this information, the GRIP team conducted searches of USASpending.gov and the System for Award Management (SAM)[7] in order to pre-populate a number of the fields. The data populated from USASpending.gov (agency information, Treasury Account Symbol, CFDA number, funding amount, project title, award date, and grant period) was tied to the grant award number entered by the recipient. The data populated from SAM (recipient name and address) was tied to the recipient's Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number.

GRIP recipient participants were able to report through a variety of mechanisms including web form and XML file submissions. If a recipient participant chose to use the webform, all FFR/SF-425 data elements that are a sum total of others (e.g., cash on hand representing cash receipts minus cash disbursements) per the standard form were calculated by the system.

GRIP recipient participants attended a webinar training session and received various documentation including data dictionaries and sample XML files. The participants determined the method by which they would report the GRIP data being collected as previously described. Some chose two methods to test and others chose only one. Two of the directly reporting GRIP recipient participants reported a total of five grants using single XML file (e.g., one grant per file) transfer. Three of the directly reporting recipient participants reported a total of seven grants using the web form. One of the directly reporting recipient participants reported a total of four grants using a bulk or batch XML file (e.g. all grants regardless of agency or program were filed together in one XML file) transmission. The four recipient participants utilizing middleware filed a total of nine grants using single XML file transfer.

A help desk email and phone number were established to assist the recipients through the process. Once the recipients submitted the data, regardless of the chosen method, they were able to log onto the system and view the data through the web form.

---

[7] SAM, managed by the General Services Administration, is the combination of federal procurement systems, including the Central Contractor Registry, with the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

Recipient Evaluation

Directly reporting recipient participants provided feedback and evaluation via both a conference call and via written evaluations. Those who used middleware to file provided feedback via a conference call.

Agency Review and Evaluation

EPA and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) participated in reviewing the GRIP data submitted from an agency perspective. EPA reviewed six individual reports and USDA reviewed four reports. Both agencies participated in a webinar conference call that provided background on the GRIP project, the means by which to log into the system, and a set of questions for the agencies to consider when viewing the submitted data online. The agencies also were given the opportunity to submit written evaluations.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORT
(Follow form instructions)

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Federal Grant or Other Identifying Number Assigned by Federal Agency (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	Page of 1		pages

3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including Zip code)

4a. DUNS Number	4b. EIN	5. Recipient Account Number or Identifying Number (To report multiple grants, use FFR Attachment)	6. Report Type ☐ Quarterly ☐ Semi-Annual ☐ Annual ☐ Final	7. Basis of Accounting ☐ Cash ☐ Accrual

8. Project/Grant Period (Month, Day, Year) From:	To:	9. Reporting Period End Date (Month, Day, Year)

10. **Transactions**	Cumulative

(Use lines a-c for single or combined multiple grant reporting)
Federal Cash (To report multiple grants separately, also use FFR Attachment):

a. Cash Receipts	
b. Cash Disbursements	
c. Cash on Hand (line a minus b)	

(Use lines d-o for single grant reporting)
Federal Expenditures and Unobligated Balance:

d. Total Federal funds authorized	
e. Federal share of expenditures	
f. Federal share of unliquidated obligations	
g. Total Federal share (sum of lines e and f)	
h. Unobligated balance of Federal funds (line d minus g)	

Recipient Share:

i. Total recipient share required	
j. Recipient share of expenditures	
k. Remaining recipient share to be provided (line i minus j)	

Program Income:

l. Total Federal share of program income earned	
m. Program income expended in accordance with the deduction alternative	
n. Program income expended in accordance with the addition alternative	
o. Unexpended program income (line l minus line m or line n)	

11. Indirect Expense	a. Type	b. Rate	c. Period From	Period To	d. Base	e. Amount Charged	f. Federal Share
				g. Totals:			

12. Remarks: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation:

13. Certification: By signing this report, I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the report is true, complete, and accurate, and the expenditures, disbursements and cash receipts are for the purposes and intent set forth in the award documents. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 18, Section 1001)

a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Authorized Certifying Official	c. Telephone (Area code, number, and extension)
	d. Email Address
b. Signature of Authorized Certifying Official	e. Date Report Submitted (Month, Day, Year)
	14. Agency use only:

Standard Form 425 - Revised 10/11/2011
OMB Approval Number: 0348-0061
Expiration Date: 2/28/2015

Appendix 1.2 Methodology; GRIP Recipient Participants and Grants Reported

Recipient	Agency	CFDA No.	Program Name	Grant No.	FDP Partner	Reporting Method
City of Bowie, MD	DOJ	16.710	Community Oriented Policing Service	2009CKWX0576		Middleware
	HUD	14.218	Community Development Block/Entitlement Grants	B-11-MC-24-0001		
College of Lake County, IL	DOL	17.282	Trade Adj Act Community College Career & Training Program	TC-22517-11-60-A-17		Middleware
Colorado State University	EPA	66.461	Regional Wetland Program Development Grants	CD-97846701	X	Direct
	DoD	12.800	Air Force Defense Research Sciences Program	FA9550-11-1-0205		
	USDA	10.206	Grants for Agricultural Research-Competitive Research	2012-67015-19506		
Nebraska, State of	DOD	12.113	State MoU Program for the Reimbursement of Technical Services	W912DY-12-1-0229		Direct
	EPA	66.605	Performance Partnership	BG-997325-07		
University of New Mexico	ED	84.015	National Resource Centers Program for Foreign Language and Area Studies	P015B100099	X	Direct
	NSF	47.076	Education and Human Resources	DRL-1038654		
North Carolina State University	EPA	66.509	Science To Achieve Results (STAR) Research Program	834264601		Middleware
	EPA	66.509	Science To Achieve Results (STAR) Research Program	83516501		
	USDA	10.307	Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative	2012-51300-20024		
University of North Carolina - Wilimington	NSF	47.074	Biological Sciences	IOS-1126938 UNCW G57173		Middleware
	DOC	11.463	NOAA/Habitat Conservation	NA12NMF4630045 UNCW G57260		
	USDA	10.206	Grants for Agricultural Research-Competitive Research	2009-35103-05336 UNCW G50945		
University of Washington	EPA	66.509	Science To Achieve Results (STAR) Research Program	RD-83169701-AM05	X	Direct
	DOI	15.608	Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance	F09AC00410 MOD02		
	NSF	47.082	Trans-NSF Recovery Act Reasearch Support	47.050 ARC-0856330AM05		
	DOC	11.468	NOAA/Applied Meteorological Research	NA08NWS4680035 AM02		
	USDA	10.310	Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI)	2011-68005-30407		
University of Wisconsin	HHS	93.359	HRSA/Nurse Education, Practice Quality and Retention Grants	D11HP22189	X	Direct
	HHS	93.866	NIH/Aging Research	P30 AG017266		
	EPA	66.469	Great Lakes Program	GL-00E00440		
	DOD	12.910	Research and Technology Development	N66001-11-1-4139		

Grants Reporting Information Project Results Report

Appendix 2: GRIP Recipient Participant Grant Award Numbers Comparison

Agency	Recipient provided Award #	Corresponding USAspending.gov Award #	Generated Universal Award Identifier (UAID)
USDA	2012-51300-20024	20125130020024.1	005G2012GZAW67
USDA	2009-35103-05336	20093510305336.1	005G20092GQRJ9
USDA	2011-68005-30407	20116800530407.1	005G2011TOL7T7
USDA	2012-67015-19506	20126701519506.1	005G2012KR1JZ2
DoC	NA12NMF4630045	NA12NMF4630045	006G2012SMU4D6
DoC	NA08NWS4680035 AM02	NA08NWS4680035	006G2010BOFUM9
DoD	N66001-11-1-4139	N660011114139	200G20120ZJXV7
DoD	W912DY-12-2-0229	W912DY1220229	200G2012AY21N1
DoD	FA9550-11-1-0205	FA95501110205	570G2012UE7X31
Ed	P015B100099	P015B100099	018G2012DTUSO5
EPA	GL-00E00440	00E00440	422G2012EECXJ4
EPA	834264601	83426401	020G20099OJA26
EPA	83516501	83516501	020G2012ZW55W8
EPA	BG-997325-07	99732507	020G2012KIXMY7
EPA	RD-83169701-AM05	83169701	020G2012FY56E9
EPA	CD-97846701	97846701	020G2009AWESE4
HHS	D11HP22189	D11HP22189	009G20123JCLH8
HHS	P30 AG017266	P30AG017266	009G2012RZHJV5
HUD	B-11-MC-24-0001	B-11-MC-24-0001	025G2012BYFJX3
DoI	F09AC00410 MOD02	813329J005	010G2009HSWPD3
DoJ	2009CKWX0576	2009CKWX0576	011G2009QJYZB4
DoL	TC-22517-11-60-A-17	TC225171160A17	012G2011VGWE86

Appendix 2: GRIP Recipient Participant Grant Award Numbers Comparison

Agency	Recipient provided Award #	Corresponding USAspending.gov Award #	Generated Universal Award Identifier (UAID)
NSF	IOS-1126938	1126938	422G2011WRRAZ3
NSF	DRL-1038654	1038654	422G2011TATJM3
NSF	47.050 ARC-0856330AM05	0856330	422G2012EECXJ4
The following grants were initially going to be reported by recipient participants but corresponding information was not found in USA Spending database.			
DoE	DE-ED0000202		
USDA	69-4532-10-004		

Appendix
2 - 2

Grants Reporting Information Project Results Report – 3/21/2013