

CHAPTER 4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1. SCOPE. The purpose of this chapter is to describe various aspects of the technical assistance project development process. The more important functions of project development are covered in this chapter and in exhibits to this Handbook. This chapter should be used in conjunction with the TA regulation, and HUD Handbooks 2210.3, 2210.17, and 2210.13 cited in Paragraph 1-3 of this Handbook.
- 4-2. PROPOSALS/APPLICATIONS. Competitive technical assistance proposals/applications are received in response to specific solicitations. Unsolicited proposals/applications are received through the unsolicited proposal process on a continuing basis.
- a. Competitive Proposals/Applications. Competitive proposals for a contract are obtained through the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP). Competitive applications for a grant or a cooperative agreement are obtained through the issuance of a Request for Grant Applications (RFGA) or a Request for Cooperative Agreement Applications (RFCAA), respectively.
 - b. Unsolicited Proposals/Applications. Unsolicited proposers or applicants submit a proposal or application on his or her own initiative following the Guidelines for Submitting Unsolicited Proposals: Community Development Technical Assistance Program booklet.
- 4-3. SELECTION PROCESS. Competitive and unsolicited proposals or applications are selected in accordance with the CDBG Technical Assistance Program Regulations, applicable requirements of the Federal and HUD Acquisition Regulations, HUD policies and procedures handbooks for procurement and discretionary grants and cooperative agreements.
- a. Criteria for Selection of Proposals/Applications. Competitive proposal or application selection is based on the selection criteria published in the solicitation document. In addition, RFGAs and RFCAAs may use program policy factors to determine a range of projects which would best serve program objectives. These "policy factors" will in no way work as selection criteria or be seen as additional criteria not subject to publication. A discussion of program policy factors may be found in Handbook 2210.17, paragraph 2-10. Unsolicited proposal or application selection is based on the selection criteria published in the Technical

Assistance Regulations, 24 CFR Part 570.402(g)(1). Also, the selection criteria for solicited applications/proposals are based on the selection criteria published in 24 CFR Part 570.402(g)(2).

- b. Reviews of Proposals/Applications. Preliminary, legal, and full, comprehensive technical reviews are conducted of technical assistance proposals/applications.

- (1) A Preliminary Review is conducted of both competitive and unsolicited proposals/applications.

- (a) Competitive Proposals/Applications. A preliminary review is conducted by OPC and/or the GTR of each competitive proposal/application to determine if it is complete and the proposer or applicant is eligible.

- If the proposal or application passes the preliminary review stage, it is fully reviewed and evaluated by members of a Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) or Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed by the Assistant Secretary for CPD.

- During the preliminary review stage, in no case will a reviewer obtain additional information from a proposer or applicant.

- (b) Unsolicited Proposals/Applications. A preliminary review is conducted by the Technical Assistance Division of unsolicited proposals or applications to determine whether the proposal or application contains sufficient technical or cost information, meets the technical assistance regulatory requirements in 24 CFR Part 570.402.

- During the Preliminary Review stage, a fourteen point "Preliminary Review" Checklist (See Exhibit 4-1) is used to record and document the technical assistance staff's determination that the above requirements and criteria have been met for a full, comprehensive technical review.

After the application or proposal passes the Preliminary Review Stage, reviewers are selected from offices with oversight responsibility, individuals with technical expertise, experience, or information necessary to conduct a full and complete review.

- (2) A Legal Review is conducted of unsolicited proposals or applications as required.

For competitive proposals or applications, a legal adviser serves as a member of the technical evaluation panel or source evaluation board during the technical review process.

- (3) A Full, Comprehensive Technical Review is also conducted of both competitive and unsolicited proposals/applications.
- (a) Each competitive proposal or application is evaluated in conformity with the Technical Assistance Regulations, Federal and HUD Acquisition Regulations, HUD Procurement and assistance handbook requirements, and the factors for award published in Requests for Proposals and Requests for Grant or Cooperative Agreement Applications.
- (b) Unsolicited Proposals/Applications. When an unsolicited proposal or application meets the Technical Assistance Regulation requirements, and passes the preliminary review stage, a full, comprehensive technical review is conducted using the "Technical Assistance Proposal Review and Recommendation" form (See Exhibit 4-2). This form assists reviewers in evaluating and documenting the extent to which the proposal or application under review meets programmatic factors and other factors required by paragraph 2-11.d of HUD Handbook 2210.17, recording of their strengths and weaknesses, and their reasons for recommending for or against funding the proposal or application.

(4) Technical Assistance Program Recommendations (Unsolicited Proposals). The Office of Technical Assistance prepares a decision abstract for the Secretary/Assistant Secretary for each unsolicited proposal which has received a full, comprehensive technical review.

(a) Each abstract, in general, includes a project description, a budget by tasks, a decision abstract, and an executive summary.

- 1 A Project Description is developed for each reviewed project and includes information on the proposer/applicant; title of the project; amount of the funding source(s); a project narrative; value of the project to the Department in furthering the TA strategy; strengths and weaknesses identified by the reviewers; and the reasons for recommending for or against funding by each reviewer.
- 2 A Budget by Tasks is developed for each project for review by the Secretary/A/S for CPD.
- 3 A Decision Abstract is developed for each project for review by Secretary/the A/S for CPD. The decision abstract includes the issue(s) to be decided; provisos for resolutions; pros/cons; and the need and/or urgency of funding the project.

Each decision abstract is accompanied by a project description, budget by tasks, and an executive summary to assist the Secretary in making a fully, informed decision with respect to selection of projects for funding.

- 4 An Executive Summary is developed to highlight the major aspects of each recommended project under

review.

- (5) Technical Assistance Program Recommendations (Competitive Initiatives). The Office of Technical Assistance prepares a decision abstract for the Secretary/Assistant Secretary for each competitive initiative identified in the TA strategy or developed by a program office as a proposal to further the strategy. Each abstract includes the title of the project; a brief description of the work tasks to be undertaken; a Government estimate of the cost of the project; and the value of the project to the Department in furthering the TA Strategy.

4-4. APPROVED TA PROJECTS. Upon receipt of the Secretary's/ Assistant Secretary's approval of the TA project, the following items must be completed: resolution of secretarial provisos, preparation of a Request for Services package, completion of a final written determination of the proposal or application and related materials for funding.

- a. Secretarial Provisos. Any proposal or application approved by the Secretary/Assistant Secretary with provisos must be resolved by the GTR or designee prior to funding.

A written determination is prepared describing how each proviso has been satisfactorily resolved. A copy of the determination resolving the provisos is submitted to the Contracting Officer with the Request for services package.

- b. Request for Services (RFS). A Request for Services package is completed by the Technical Assistance Division (TAD) for each technical assistance project approved by the Secretary/Assistant Secretary for funding.

The RFS package includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (1) Request for Services Memorandum, HUD Form-522, (See Exhibit 4-3) is completed, signed and dated by the appropriate officials.

6549.01

- (2) Statement of Work (SOW) is developed by tasks and/or subtasks with performance requirements, products, or deliverables.

- (3) Proposed Budget Estimate is costed out by tasks as well as broken down by major cost elements.
- (4) Project Management Plan describes how the proposer/applicant will carry out the project activities.
- (5) Factors for Award are included for competitive requirements with weights assigned.
- (6) Funds Reservation and Contract Authority, HUD Form-718, is completed with appropriate signatures.
- (7) A Special Requirement: Where under the terms of the funding award the recipient of the funding is to select the recipients of the technical assistance to be provided, the funding recipient shall publish, and publicly make available to potential technical assistance recipients, the availability of such assistance and the specific criteria to be used for the selection of the recipients to be assisted.

c. Written Determination. To ensure that the selection process concerns have been adequately addressed, a final written determination is made using the "Community Development Technical Assistance Program Checklist for RFS's to OPC" (See Exhibit 4-4). This determination covers such items as secretarial provisos, CDBG nexus, clarity of SOW, PMP, GTR training, level-of-effort analysis, and the completeness of the Request for Services package.

4-5. NOTIFICATION. HUD provide notification of whether a project will be funded or rejected in accordance with 24 CFR Part 570.402 (h) (4) (i) (2)

4-6. RESPONSIBILITIES.

a. Director, OTA, is responsible for developing final decision abstracts for review and approval or disapproval by the A/S for CPD and the Secretary.

10/90

4-6

6549.01

b. Director, TAD, is responsible for:

- (1) Processing unsolicited proposals or applications for a preliminary review and the full, comprehensive reviews. Preparing/

assuring adequacy of Statements of Work, Notices of Fund Availability and related documents for competitive projects and chairing/serving on the Technical Evaluation Panels (TEP) and Source Evaluation Boards (SEB).

- (2) Completing the Request for Services package for each project approved by the Secretary.
- (3) Making a final review and written determination that concerns raised during the selection process have been adequately addressed prior to submission of the RFS package to the Office of Procurement and Contracts.

c. The Regional Administrator is responsible for:

- (1) Ensuring that a timely review is conducted of proposals or applications assigned his/her Region.
- (2) Ensuring that all secretarial provisos and other concerns raised during the selection process have been adequately addressed prior to submission of the RFS package to the Regional Contracting Officer.

d. The GTR is responsible for:

- (1) Reviewing proposals/applications and making a recommendation for or against funding.
- (2) Making a final review of the SOW for clarity, conciseness, and completeness.
- (3) Resolving to the satisfaction of the Assistant Secretary for CPD all provisos prior to submission of the Request for Services package for signature.
- (4) Developing a position with respect to the approximate level-of-effort analysis of the number and types of personnel proposed, the labor-hours or personnel days, and so on.

- (5) Reviewing the accuracy and approving of the Project Management Plan, and any revisions thereof.
 - (6) Serving on/chairing the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) and Source Evaluation Board (SEB) for competitive proposals or applications.
- e. The General Counsel is responsible for:
 - (1) Reviewing statements of work for legal sufficiency as requested.
 - (2) Serving as legal advisor to the TEP or SEB for competitive proposals or applications under review.
- f. The Contracting/Grant/Cooperative Agreement Officer (Headquarters OPC and Regional Offices) is responsible for serving as advisors to the Technical Evaluation Panels (TEPs) and Source Evaluation Boards (SEBs), negotiating the final agreement between HUD and the technical assistance provider, and administering the resultant grant, contract a cooperative agreement.