

MEETING AGENDA

VIRTUAL:

Tuesday, September 27, 2022

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

- ◆ Call to Order

- ◆ Welcome/Introductions

- ◆ Approval of Agenda

- ◆ Approval of Minutes (*December 6, 2021*)

- ◆ Report of Co-Chairs

- ◆ Report of Staff

- ◆ Discussion Item
 - Virtual, Hybrid, and In-Person Meetings

- ◆ Other Business

- ◆ Announcements

- ◆ Adjournment

Please contact the office at least 5 days in advance if you require special assistance.

The next Executive Committee meeting is

TBD

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12TH Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 574-6760 • FAX (215) 574-6761 • www.hivphilly.org



Philadelphia HIV Integrated Planning Council
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes of
Monday, December 6, 2021
12:00-2:00p.m.

Office of HIV Planning, 340 N. 12th Street, Suite 320, Philadelphia PA 19107

Present: Alan Edelstein, Sharee Heaven, Lupe Diaz, Mike Cappuccilli, Gus Grannan, Clint Steib, David Gana, Loretta Matus

Staff: Mari Ross-Russell, Sofia Moletteri, Julia Henrikson

Call to Order: L. Diaz offered to chair and called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. She skipped the introductions since everyone was familiar with each other.

Approval of Agenda: L. Diaz presented the December 2021 Executive Committee agenda for approval. **Motion:** M. Cappuccilli motioned, A. Edelstein seconded to approve the December 2021 agenda. **Motion passed:** all in favor. The December 2021 Executive Committee agenda was approved.

Approval of Minutes (July 1, 2021): **Motion:** G. Grannan motioned, D. Gana seconded to approve the July 2021 meeting minutes. **Motion passed:** 6 in favor, 1 abstaining. The July 2021 Executive Committee minutes were approved.

Report of Staff:

M. Ross-Russell reported that the Consumer Survey was approved and was exempt from the IRB. They could now move forward. Additionally, they had received the Spanish translation. She had forwarded the survey to S. Moletteri with L. Matus's corrections.

She also reported that they had received a lot of feedback around the membership report submitted in June 2021. 90 days after the Notice of Grant Award, OHP submits a program terms report. It typically contained the membership roster, representation, categories, etc. for HIPC members. The Project Officer questioned the submission. The first question was about the 53 members listed. As an answer, they reported on March 1st-February 28th, so this included all members, including those dropping off and joining. Currently, there were 46 members, so there was a bit of confusion. There were only three categories in which people could represent two different categories. Dual representation became a topic of conversation and confusion as well.

The reality is that sometimes HIPC will wait months for official appointment from the mayor's office, so for the time being, those appointed were not officially considered members when reported.

S. Moletteri reported that there was a Doodle poll sent out for the Recruitment Ad-Hoc Workgroup—there would likely be a meeting on December 15th. There was no set time yet, but it would either be 12 p.m. or 2 p.m. She asked that those with a preference email her the best time.

M. Cappuccilli asked if the Site Visit findings came as a recommendation or if they were more of an ongoing conversation. M. Ross-Russell said it was mostly submitted as a recommendation or

comment that OHP needed to respond to within a certain timeframe. As a part of monthly responses/meetings, they work on direct responses by including the topics within HIPC and subcommittee meetings. For example, they would be working on the Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form today. This was in direct response to the HRSA Site Visit.

M. Ross-Russell said that recruitment and matching the epidemic was often difficult. HIPC would always try its best, but sometimes it was suggested that the HIPC match the demographics of the epidemic exactly 1:1. L. Diaz commented that regarding the 1:1 match, epidemic numbers fluctuated, so it would always be a race to meet old numbers. M. Ross-Russell said that the HIPC had staff, but the HIPC itself was made of volunteers. There had to be some acknowledgment that these individuals were volunteering their time. M. Cappuccilli said that realistically, they could not find a 1:1 planning body anywhere throughout the country. M. Ross-Russell agreed, noting that they would try their best to meet the requirements. Just because they had not met 1:1 did not mean they were ignoring the request to match the epidemic.

Discussion Items:

—Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism Form—

A. Edelstein noted that this was coming from the Finance Committee. It related to the Site Visit requests. The reviewers noted that the HIPC did not have a formal process in place for monitoring the administrative mechanism. Thus, they needed to develop a form that referred to the efficiency and completion of certain items. A. Edelstein noted that S. Moletteri had created the form. S. Moletteri explained that she just crafted the first draft of the form but M. Ross-Russell had been working more continuously on the edits.

A. Edelstein said the current version he was presenting was the form's final draft. They could also feel free modify the items and language.

A. Edelstein read the language on the form that was included from the RWHAP Part A Manual. He noted that every item would follow the same format. Each item would have the following: (1) a description, (2) a "yes," "no," and "N/A" checkbox to indicate completion, (3) timeframe for report, (4) group responsible for reporting, and (5) an any additional notes section. Each item occurred over a different timeframe since each item happened/reports only became available during different parts of the calendar year/planning cycle. The Finance Committee would be the group to fill out the form.

He next read the *Procurement Process* portion of the form. This part contained 3 separate items where the group responsible was the recipient. In each of these, the recipient would present to the Finance Committee who in turn would present to the HIPC. M. Cappuccilli asked about the recipient meeting with Finance Committee 6 months prior to the RFP distribution. D. Gana noted that the recipient could not offer too much information to the Finance Committee so as not to give unfair advantage to provider members. A. Edelstein said it was not unfair advantage to only inform the committee of the RFP. They would not offer specific details of the RFP content—the Finance Committee would not influence how the recipient would select agencies or look into the details.

M. Ross-Russell explained that the last time they received notice of an RFP, it was about the MCM service. The recipient notified the HIPC that they, the recipient, would need to alter the MCM service delivery system and explained why it was necessary. They did not tell the HIPC the content of the RFP, only the timeline and explanation as to why. M. Ross-Russell added that because of the size

and complexity of the system, the recipient could notify individuals of an RFP as far as 9 months before it was actually released. A. Edelstein agreed, adding that the recipient was also notified other parties of the MCM-related RFP in various venues, not just the HIPC. M. Ross-Russell noted that in the case of the HIPC funding a service not currently funded under RW Part A, this would almost always call for an RFP.

C. Steib commented that sometimes, RFPs were rushed where 6 months was not a reasonable timeline. He also noted that, regarding wordsmithing, he thought RFPs were now called NOFOs. M. Ross-Russell said she would look into the name. Otherwise, the RFPs that were usually rushed were from the CDC. A. Edelstein said that these were prevention which the HIPC did not deal with. In the case where six months was not applicable, they would make note of this and not wait the six months for the notification.

G. Grannan asked about the report back on the outcome of the process (third item of the procurement portion). He asked if they should specifically include rationale behind distribution of funds in geographical locations. Geographical location was contained within the item, but he was interested in knowing how much money was put where (geographically) and why. A. Edelstein said they could add this within the language. G. Grannan said they did not need to add the language, he just wanted to ensure the current language did not exclude that from the recipient's report. A. Edelstein said it could be addressed in the committee's notes, so they could ask questions about this and the recipient would be able to respond.

A. Edelstein read the *Contracting* portion of the form. There were no questions or comments.

He next read the *Reimbursement of Subrecipients* portion of the form which contained two items. He commented on how Finance Committee/HIPC continuously received the quarterly spending reports.

He next read the *Use of Funds* portion of the form which contained four items. For the first item, they were already notified ASAP for Notice of Grant Award. For the second item, they were notified of this during the quarterly spending reports. The third was also addressed during the quarterly reports. The last item was also already routine for the recipient and Finance Committee/HIPC.

He next read the *Engagement with the PC/B in the planning process* portion, PC/B meaning Planning Council/Body. This contained two items. He suggested that the abbreviation be expanded for clarity. If recipient members were attending monthly, they would need to figure out the timeframe. He suggested that the timeframe for reporting be soon after the conclusion of the contract year.

The second item under this category, regarding the directives, was a timeframe that M. Ross-Russell felt was reasonable. M. Cappuccilli was glad to see the directives within the form because this was often something that fell behind regarding reports back.

To review, A. Edelstein said the proposal the Finance Committee was making to the Executive Committee was for the HIPC to adopt this form as a means to monitor the administrative mechanism within specified timeframes. Finance Committee would score and respond to the form, then presenting it to the HIPC. He asked if they should first present the report to Executive Committee and then HIPC or if they should present it to the HIPC straight away.

He asked that they formalize the reporting process. For example, they would need to work out the details and identify who would be consulted in the case of an issue within the form. M. Ross-Russell

said that this form needed to be completed at the end of each planning cycle. The problem then was identifying when exactly the end of the planning cycle would be. As an example of gray area, HIPC did not receive a year-end report until after the planning year finished. A. Edelstein asked, hypothetically, in the case that Finance Committee uncovered an issue, if they would have the option of identifying a problem and suggesting next steps. M. Ross-Russell said next steps could include talking to the Executive Committee and then meeting with the recipient. Next steps, she explained, would differ depending on the item and the issue at hand.

M. Ross-Russell suggested that her and S. Moletteri come up with language that identify timeline and use of the form within the introduction. They could consider the end of the planning cycle after the presentation of the year-end spending report. If there were any issues, they could bring it to the Executive Committee.

A. Edelstein suggested they approve the form today and circulate the draft language for timeline and other introductory language to the Executive and Finance Committee for review. Everyone agreed that process would be fine.

S. Moletteri suggested that for a plan of action: (1) Executive Committee approve the form with suggested changes, (2) OHP make and distribute the changes, (3) Executive and Finance Committees review the changes and offer comments, and (4) the amended form is presented to HIPC this Thursday.

Motion: A. Edelstein motioned that the Executive Committee recommend the HIPC approve the Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form with the suggested changes which are to be reviewed and accepted by Finance and Executive Committee prior to the HIPC meeting, G. Grannan seconded.

Vote:

G. Grannan: in favor
A. Edelstein: in favor
C. Steib: in favor
M. Cappuccilli: in favor
S. Heaven: in favor
D. Gana: in favor
L. Matus: in favor
L. Diaz: in favor

Motion passed: The Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism form with the suggested changes was approved for recommendation by the Executive Committee. All in favor.

Other Business:

L. Diaz asked if they wanted to schedule the next meeting or wait until something came up. M. Ross-Russell said OHP would schedule this as needed. Additionally, she would wordsmith the Administrative Mechanism form and send it out to Executive and Finance Committee members either at the end of the day today or tomorrow morning.

Announcements:

C. Steib announced that he would not be able to attend the next HIPC meeting.

Adjournment: Motion: D. Gana motioned to adjourn the December 6, 2021 Executive Committee meeting, A. Edelstein seconded. Motion passed: all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Sofia M. Moletteri, staff

Handouts distributed:

- December 2021 Executive Meeting Agenda
- July 2021 Executive Meeting Minutes
- Monitoring the Administrative Mechanism Form

DRAFT