

Using Federal Grant Data to Inform State and Local Planning¹

***"The utility of the FFATA database will be greatly enhanced
with the addition of program activity codes"***

December, 2008

***Janet F. Rosenzweig MS, PhD, MPA²
With Mark Ginalski, Esq., MPA***

¹ This initial version of this paper was written to fulfill a graduate course requirement at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

² Janet Rosenzweig can be reached at jfrosenzweig@comcast.net; inquiries regarding participation in future NGP-sponsored discussions of this topic can contact Bill Levis, NCCS, The Urban Institute, qrlevis@aol.com.

Abstract

The purpose of this project is to explore options for using federal grant data for state, local and multi-disciplinary service planning. This paper starts with an introduction to federal grant making and explores the federal role in facilitating local and state planning. The focus moves to the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 – known as FFATA , examines the database created under that legislation and concludes that the utility of the database will be greatly enhanced with the addition of activity codes. For example, a link from Grants.gov to the searchable database of Nonprofit Program Classification (NPC) codes³ maintained by the National Center for Charitable Statistics at The Urban Institute would enable applicants to identify the NPC activity code that best describes their activities under the grant for which they are applying; the NPC code can be established at the time of application and maintained in subsequent reports.

³ See Nonprofit Program Classification System (NPC) at <http://nccs.urban.org/classification/index.cfm>

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Abstract | 2 |
| Federal grants and state and local planning | 4 |
| 1968: The federal government mandates state coordination: OMB Circular A-95 | 5 |
| 1982: The Regan Administration removes the mandate with Executive Order 12372 | 6 |
| 1999: Modernizing Federal Grant-Making; PL 106-107 | 7 |
| 2006: The Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act | 9 |
| FFATA Activity Coding | 11 |
| The FFATA Sub-award Pilot | 11 |
| Exhibit 1 - Assistance for 93.778: Medical Assistance Program (FY 2000-2008) | 12 |
| The National Grants Partnership | 12 |
| The Taxonomies, or accepted lists of codes | 13 |
| References | 15 |
| Appendix 1 National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities – Core Codes (NTEE-CC) | 16 |
| Appendix 2 – WWW.USASPENDING.GOV DATA DICTIONARY FOR GRANTS AND ASSISTANCE | 18 |

Federal grants and state and local planning

The federal government disburses hundreds of billions of dollars in grants each year to state and local governments, quasi public and non-profit agencies in the United States. Throughout the country, public administrators rely on these funds to supplement local and state revenue sources; indeed, federal funds are the preferred source for most local and state public administrators because they have no impact on the local tax base. Public administrators focus on identifying sources of available federal funds and expend considerable effort to obtain them for their jurisdiction; increasing federal funds into a state is often a benchmark for an administration. But most states lack a centralized system to track the federal funds that come into their jurisdiction. In what ways do grants overlap? How are these funds coordinated? Is it possible that an organization is receiving federal support for a project that is not consistent with state policy objectives? Given the magnitude of the federal financial participation in local service delivery, valid, reliable and accessible information on grants has the potential to be a remarkable resource for service coordination and planning. Federal regulations encouraging local coordination and planning existed for many years and were weakened as a component of the Regan – era devolution from federal categorical grants to state block grants. No systematic tracking methodology has been developed to replace Great Society era mandates for state review of any application for federal funds.

This project was initiated in response to request from Prevent Child Abuse - America, a national organization with chapters in 43 states. Chapters throughout the United States receive grants from various agencies within the Departments of Health and Human Services and the Departments of Labor and Education. How

can each state chapter identify fellow stakeholders and service providers working to provide support services to parents? It would be exceptionally useful for the chapters to be able to identify the sources and recipient agencies of federal funds in their state. This issue is relevant to any policy area that crosses disciplines; the results of this work are applicable to any service field where service providers receives federal funds.

1968: The federal government mandates state coordination: OMB Circular A-95

The provisions of OMB Circular A-95 were designed to implement the Model Cities Act (1966) and Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (1968). In general, its purpose was to build greater coherence into the involvement of state and sub-state entities” (Gordon, 1974 page 49) “OMB circular A-95 was a further step in the direction of more explicit and systematic patterns of intergovernmental cooperation across a wide range of planning and development activities supported by the national government. The requirements specified by A-95 constituted essentially more regularized procedures for program agencies and federal project applicants to touch base with one another and with planning entities at the state, regional and local levels in order to coordinate their plans and render them more consistent. This was meant to apply to federal government agencies engaged in the allocation of grants in aid and to those engaged in direct federal development activities....” (Gordon, 1974)

Circular A-95 called for the development of a Project Notification and Review System (PNRS) designed to meet several objectives, including an ‘early warning system’ to ‘facilitate state, regional and local planning and development assisted

under various federal programs. (Gordon page 53) This PNRS system caused all applicants for federal grants – non-profit organizations, educational institutions, local and state governments -- to seek and receive approval from their *state clearinghouse* before sending an application off to Washington D.C. This provided the federal government with some sense that the state approved the applicants intended project, and gave the state a comprehensive view of all applications.

1982: The Regan Administration removes the mandate with Executive Order 12372

Much has been written about the Regan administration and the intention of devolving authority to the states. This philosophy was a hallmark of the Regan administration. Through the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) of 1981, various categorical grant programs were reorganized into nine block grants made directly to states; the Federal government reduced their total outlay by \$6 billion. Executive Order 12372 replaced OMB Circular A-95 and made state-level coordination optional. (Executive Order 12372 can be read at <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/rgeo12372.pdf>). The goal of this Executive Order was to reduce the federal role in state's decisions about spending federal funds. Specifically, section 7 rescinds the sections of A-95 which apply to the states:

Sec. 7. The Memorandum of November 8, 1968, is terminated (33 *Fed. Reg.* 16487, November 13, 1968). The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall revoke OMB Circular A-95, which was issued pursuant to that Memorandum. However, Federal agencies shall continue to comply with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to that Memorandum, including those issued by the Office of Management and Budget, until new rules and regulations have been issued in accord with this Order.

States were given the option to develop their own process as described in Section 2 of E.O. 12372:

Sec. 2. To the extent the States, in consultation with local general purpose governments, and local special purpose governments they consider appropriate, develop their own processes or refine existing processes for State and local elected officials to review and coordinate proposed Federal financial assistance and direct Federal development, the Federal agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law: (a) Utilize the State process to determine official views of State and local elected officials

Given the reduction in funding to the states, it is not surprising that many states chose to economize by eliminating their now-voluntary clearinghouse. OMB is required to maintain a list of state clearinghouses; currently only 22 states have them – see <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.html> (link live as of December 2008) for a list of clearinghouses. Further evidence of the demise of the clearinghouse system can be seen in the new database established under FFATA; there is a field for the 'state clearinghouse application identification number' but it was blank on 100% of the grants in a list generated by a routine search. State-level coordination is, at best not uniform and therefore not amenable to cross-state, multi-disciplinary analyses.

1999: Modernizing Federal Grant-Making; PL 106-107

In 1993, The Clinton administration set a theme of re-inventing government with the mission to create a government that "works better, costs less, and gets results Americans care about" and established the National Partnership for Reinventing Government . See <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/whoweare/history2.html>) This initiative was dedicated to taking full advantage of emerging information technologies to improve the functioning of federal government. In 1999, Congress

passed the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act, Public Law 106-107.

“The purposes of P. L. 106-107 are to (1) improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, (2) simplify Federal financial assistance application and reporting requirements, (3) improve the delivery of services to the public, and (4) facilitate greater coordination among those responsible for delivering the services. P. L. 106-107 requires the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to direct, coordinate, and assist Federal agencies in establishing a common application and reporting system, including electronic processes, and uniform administrative rules for Federal financial assistance programs across different Federal agencies.” <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/preamble2.html>

Thanks to the innovations pursuant to this law, potential applicants for federal funds can now find a database of all available funds through an on-line searchable version of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (www.cfda.gov). The common application referenced in P.L. 106-106 can be found at www.grants.gov .

The goals of P.L. 106-107 are clearly directed towards streamlining the application processes both for applicants and the federal agencies; unlike the days of A-95 review, state government is below the radar. Grants.gov staff from OMB were interviewed to determine the possibility of using general information from electronic grant applications as a searchable database. For planning purposes, identifying applicants can be most useful; grant applicants are most likely already stakeholders in the service field of the application. However, this potentially rich source of service data is not available. OMB staff describe grants.gov’s function as a ‘post office’ and forwards all of the applicant files to the various federal funding entities which own the application data. (Telephone conversation, Rebecca Fergusson, OMB 1-7 08; originally cited Rosenzweig and Ginalski, 2007).

The reviews for PL 106-107 have been mixed. While clearly streamlining the application process, users cite implementation problems. In April 2005 the

Government Accountability Office (GAO) evaluated the effectiveness of P.L. 106-107 Grantees reported:

- The need to use several different systems for applications, reporting, and payments;
- Term definitions differ across agencies;
- Some inefficiencies continue to exist, such as agency grant processes not aligning with typical grantee business practices; and,
- Problems using Grants.gov, such as search engine problems, complex registration practices, and submission difficulties that have caused grantee frustration in using the site.”(cited in the National Grants Partnership White paper, November 2007)

Improvements continue to be made to grants.gov but there is no known interest in generating reports from data on applicants or exploring the potential to use this data for planning.

2006: The Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act

USA>Domestic Politics

from the July 20, 2006 edition Christian Science Monitor (accessed December, 2007)



BIPARTISAN BACKING:
Champions of a new database on federal spending include Republican Sen. John McCain (left) and Democratic Sen. Barack Obama.
LARRY DOWNING/REUTERS;
KEVIN LAMARQUE/REUTERS

Bi -partisan support for transparency

Designed to shed light on ‘pork-barrel’ spending, FFATA was signed into law in September 2006. Relevant language states:

Not later than January 1, 2008, the Office of Management and Budget shall, in accordance with this section, section 204 of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347; 44 U.S.C. 3501 note), and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.), ensure the existence and operation of a single searchable website, accessible by the public at no cost to access, that includes for each Federal award—

(A) The name of the entity receiving the award;

(B) The amount of the award;

(C) information on the award including transaction type, funding agency, the North American Industry Classification System code or Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number (where applicable), program source, and an award title descriptive of the purpose of each funding action;

(D) the location of the entity receiving the award and the primary location of performance under the award, including the city, State, congressional district, and country;

(E) A unique identifier of the entity receiving the award and of the parent entity of the recipient, should the entity be owned by another entity; and

(F) Any other relevant information specified by the Office of Management and Budget.

[The Federal Funding Accountability And Transparency Act Of 2006. Reviewed January 11, 2008 [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/pubpress/2006/fact_sheet_transparency.pdf]]

The database mandated by FFATA can be found at www.USASPENDING.GOV.

This database holds extraordinary potential to meet the stated objective of providing public transparency and it also shows promise as a tool for planning. Indeed, FFATA provides the best opportunity to promote inter-governmental relations through cross jurisdiction and multi-disciplinary planning and since E.O. 12372 rescinded the order for states to maintain clearinghouses.

This remarkable database carries details down to the contract modification level for federal grants and contracts. On March 31, 2008, the site reported that data entry was @ 2/3 complete; by December 2008 the competition rate approaches 100% in all major categories. Data elements for each grant include the identifying information on the grantee, identifying information on the granting federal agency, and a text based field with a project description. A complete data dictionary is reproduced as Appendix I. This database is an amazing opportunity

to see WHO is receiving federal funds. What we can not yet see is the proposed use of the funds. Activity codes are necessary.

Activity Coding:

Each entry in www.USASPENDING.GOV contains a project description as a searchable text field. The text does not follow a uniform format and in many cases the field is blank. Text entered without a standard format is not amenable to systematic analysis, rendering this field useless for planning. Using a standard activity code would alleviate this weakness. The FFATA sub-award process provides an opportunity to add one.

FFATA Sub-award Pilot

Currently, www.USASPENDING.GOV lacks detail for large grants, particularly to states, which are then re-distributed as smaller grants, or 'sub-awards'. For example, a search on CFDA code 93.778 yielded the list below, showing a large grant to a state redistributed to 'multiple recipients' FFATA requires that states provide detail of the sub-award recipients in a consistent format for inclusion in the www.USASPENDING.GOV database by July 1, 2009. A sub-award pilot work group has been established by The National Grants Partnership.

Exhibit 1 Assistance for 93.778: Medical Assistance Program (FY 2000-2008)Top 10

Recipients

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Multiple recipients - New York | \$214,292,363,398 |
| Multiple recipients - California | \$164,321,066,523 |
| Multiple recipients - Texas | \$101,917,206,423 |
| Multiple recipients - Pennsylvania | \$69,526,229,988 |
| Multiple recipients - Florida | \$62,783,594,491 |
| Multiple recipients – Ohio | \$58,989,949,759 |
| Multiple recipients - Illinois | \$48,963,265,691 |
| Multiple recipients – North Carolina | \$45,840,565,776 |
| Multiple recipients - Michigan | \$44,099,097,264 |

FFATA requires that states report the recipients of all sub-awards by July, 2009

The National Grants Partnership (NGP)

“The National Grants Partnership was established in 2004 to bring together government and non-government individuals with an interest in improving the grants process in the United States. The NGP has identified several projects on which its members are working and anticipates undertaking further projects related to streamlining the grants process, funding the grants process more efficiently, and communicating new developments in applying, accounting and reporting for grants. The NGP provides to stakeholders a forum for discussion and research on grants administration issues.” (www.TheNGP.org, accessed 3/24/2007). One of the more active stakeholder groups of the NGP is the Uniform Guidelines Coalition and its technical advisory group. Bill Levis, an active member of the NGP collaborated on this paper and agreed that the following statement best describes the current status:

A weakness in using USASPENDING.GOV for state, local and multi-disciplinary planning is the inability to identify what the grantee is doing, and for whom they are doing it. Unless implicit in the CFDA code, we do not know what the grantee is doing to meet the objective. One suggested solution is the use of uniform activity codes.

The NGP has been a leader in promoting uniform fiscal and activities coding among public and non-profit organizations. Through the National Grants Partnership, a work group comprised of representatives from government in several states is developing processes that will meet the FFATA sub-award reporting

objective. The planning committee is largely comprised of state government officials, some of whom are interested in using this as an opportunity to ensure that FFATA data is as useful as possible for state planning. The sub-award pilot provides a strategic opportunity to consider the modification of grant application and reporting requirements to include a code indicating the activity being carried out under the grant.

The National Center for Charitable Statistics, (NCCS) a program of the Urban Institute offers the best option for a dictionary of activity codes already in use.

The Taxonomies, or accepted lists of codes

The NCCS developed the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities. The National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) offers a definitive classification system for nonprofit organizations recognized as tax exempt under the Internal Revenue Code. These charitable organizations are exempt from federal taxes because of their religious, educational, scientific, and public purposes. The broad range of their activities includes health, human services, arts and culture, education, research, and advocacy." (Lamkin, et. al | 2001) A secondary taxonomy maintained by the National Center for Charitable Statistics is the NPC codes, or Non-Profit program classification. While the NTEE describes the 'entity' or organization, the NPC code describes the activity. Searchable databases of both NTEE and NPC codes are maintained by the National Center for Charitable statistics at <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/NCCS/Public/>.

The NPC (non-profit program classification system) is a very complete taxonomy. A link from Grants.gov to the searchable database should be provided to

enable applicants to identify the NPC activity code that best describes their activities under the grant for which they are applying. The NPC code can be established at the time of application and maintained in subsequent reports. The FFATA database could add this code as a field in the searchable database, thus enabling service planners to make very practical use of this new, transparent data.

There is no question that the current wealth of grant data could produce much more useful information if the A-95 rules had remained in effect and were supported by internet technology. Now, an opportunity exists to create more useful options by adding a link from grants.gov to the NCCS databases enabling applicants to identify an activity code. This code can then be stored in grants.gov and the records used to create the FFATA database. This would provide a remarkably useful resource for planners and public administrators throughout the United States.

References:

Websites:

WWW.USASPENDING.GOV

<http://nccsdataweb.urban.org>

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/spoc.htm>

<http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/rgeo12372.pdf>

www.cfda.gov

www.grants.gov

<http://www.thengp.org/about.htm>

<http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/whoweare/history2.html>

Articles and Publications:

The GAO, February 2006: RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT More Assurance Is Needed That Grant Funding Information Is Accurately Reported

The GAO, July 2006: Grants management: Grantees Concerns with Efforts to Streamline and Simplify Processes

Gordon, George J. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95: Perspectives and Implications Publius, Vol. 4, No. 1. (Winter, 1974), pp. 45-68.

Lampkin, Linda; Romeo Sheryl; Finnin, Emily: Introducing the Nonprofit Program Classification System: The Taxonomy We've Been Waiting For National Center for Charitable Statistics at the Urban Institute's Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 30, no. 4, December 2001 781-793

The National Grants Partnership White Paper Series, The Need for Federal Grants Management Standards (November 2007) Reviewed on line – January 2, 2008. [http://www.thengp.org/documents/NGPNeedForFedGMStandards1107.pdf]

Rosenzweig, Janet and Ginalski, Mark -- Federal Grant Data Compilation A New Methodology for a New Generation class project for *Leadership for a Networked World*, Fall 2007 Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government

Russo, Philip A; In Search of Intergovernmental Coordination: The A-95 Project Notification and Review System Publius, Vol. 12, No. 2. (Spring, 1982), pp. 49-62.

Appendix 1

National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities - Core Codes (NTEE-CC)

<http://nccs2.urban.org/ntee-cc/index.htm>

Using the NTEE-CC

The NTEE-CC classification system divides the universe of nonprofit organizations into 26 major groups under 10 broad categories as follows:

| | <u>Major Group</u> |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| I. Arts, Culture, and Humanities | A |
| II. Education | B |
| III. Environment and Animals | C, D |
| IV. Health | E, F, G, H |
| V. Human Services | I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P |
| VI. International, Foreign Affairs | Q |
| VII. Public, Societal Benefit | R, S, T, U, V, W |
| VIII. Religion Related | X |
| IX. Mutual/Membership Benefit | Y |
| X. Unknown, Unclassified | Z |

Within the major groups, organizations are broken down according to logical divisions (decile level codes) and subdivisions (centile level codes). Organizations that exist across all or most of the 26 major groups are treated separately and are given what is known as "common codes".

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Major Groups (1st Digit) | Alphabetic |
| Decile Codes (2nd Digit) | Numeric |
| Centile Codes (3rd Digit) | Alphanumeric |
| Common Codes (2nd-4th Digit) | Numeric |

Major Groups. The major groups represent broad subsectors, such as health, education, and youth development, of the charitable organization universe. For descriptions, see the Definitions section.

Decile Codes. Decile codes subdivide organizations in the major groups by specific activity areas, such as Higher Education within the Education major group. See Definitions section for a full listing of decile codes.

Centile Codes. Centile codes subdivide organizations in the decile codes into specific types of organizations. For example, junior colleges, undergraduate colleges, and universities have separate centile codes within Higher Education (B40). See the Definitions section for a full listing.

Common Codes. Common codes represent activities of organizations, such as research, fundraising, and technical assistance, which are common to all major groups. The seven common codes used are:

- 01 Alliance/Advocacy Organizations
- 02 Management and Technical Assistance
- 03 Professional Societies/Associations
- 05 Research Institutes and/or Public Policy Analysis
- 11 Monetary Support - Single Organization
- 12 Monetary Support - Multiple Organizations
- 19 Nonmonetary Support Not Elsewhere Classified (N.E.C.)

Common codes differ from other codes in that a fourth-digit is available. This digit, used within the common code framework, indicates a kind of organization within a group of organizations. For example, B114 would designate college and university fundraising under B11 Monetary Support. The "4" was chosen from the decile level, B40 Higher Education Institutions. Conversely, high school booster clubs would be classified as B112 (B11 Monetary Support - Single Organization plus B20 Elementary, Secondary Education, K–12.)

Another example of coding is classifying the tax-exempt "St. Christopher Hospital" as E22; the major group is E for Health, and the decile and centile codes (22) designate a General Hospital. A professional society called "The Learned Society of Landscape Photographers" would be given an NTEE-CC code of A034; the major group is A for Arts, the common code 03 designates the organization as a professional society and the fourth digit (4) signifies visual arts organizations.

An organization that raises funds for a specific organization, such as a single hospital ("Friends of St. Christopher Hospital") receives a code of E112; an organization that raises funds for several hospitals ("Friends of Memphis Hospitals") receives a code of E122.

Appendix 2

USASPENDING.GOV

DATA DICTIONARY FOR GRANTS AND ASSISTANCE

<http://www.usaspending.gov/aboutdata.php> 3/31/2008

Federal Assistance Data Dictionary

This is a list of all of the data fields in USAspending.govs copy of the Federal Assistance Awards Data System (Federal Assistance Awards Data System) (federal assistance) database. It can be used to see what kind of data each field displayed in the extensive or complete levels of detail contains. The "Field Type" column provides the type and size of the field, in case you wish to load USAspending.gov data into your own database. The "% blank" column shows what percentage of the data records have the data field blank -- this can be useful when you want to estimate whether a particular data element is well maintained or not.

| Data Field | Description | Field Type |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Recipient Name | The name of the recipient of the award. | varchar(45) |
| Recipient City Code | The five-digit FIPS city code for the city in the address of the recipient of the award. | varchar(5) |
| Recipient City Name | The city in which the address of the recipient of the award is located. | varchar(21) |
| Recipient County Code | The three-digit FIPS county code for the county in which the address for the recipient of the award is located. | char(3) |
| Recipient County Name | The county in which the address for the recipient of the award is located. | varchar(21) |
| Recipient State Code | The two-digit FIPS state code for the state or territory in which the address for the recipient of the award is located. | char(2) |
| Recipient State Name | The name of the state or territory in which the address for the recipient of the award is located. | varchar(25) |
| Recipient Zip Code | The Zip code in the address of the recipient of the award. | varchar(9) |
| Congressional District | The Congressional District of the recipient, modified by USAspending.gov to fix some bad data and to use a 2-letter state followed by 2 digit format. 90 means not known, 00 means at large or statewide, 98 means nonvoting, 99 means no representative. | varchar(4) |
| Recipient Congressional District | The Congressional district in which the address of the recipient of the award is located. 90 indicates district not known, 00 at-large or statewide, 98 nonvoting, 99 no representative. | char(2) |
| Recipient Category | The original Federal Assistance Awards Data System recipient type code, modified by USAspending.gov into a set of broader categories (government, individual, nonprofit, for profit, higher ed, other). | char(1) |
| Recipient Type | The type of recipient (i.e., state government, local government, Indian tribe, individual, small business, for-profit, nonprofit, etc.) | char(2) |

Project and Award Info

This section shows information about which agency granted the award under what governmental program, and provides some ID numbers for the award.

| Data Field | Description | Field Type |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------|
| Major Agency | The original Federal Assistance Awards Data System agency code, modified by USAspending.gov to show the major agency giving out the award. Major agencies are generally departments of the government. All minor agencies are listed within a general category. | char(2) |
| Agency Code | A code indicating which governmental agency or bureau provided the award. | varchar(4) |
| Agency Name | The name of the governmental agency or bureau that provided the award. | varchar(72) |
| Federal Award ID | An agency-specific unique ID number for each individual assistance award. There may be more than one action record per assistance award, because of continuations, revisions, funding adjustments, corrections, etc. | varchar(16) |
| Federal Award ID Modification | A modification number used to indicate action records that modify a previous action record with the same federal award ID. | varchar(4) |
| State Application ID Number | A number assigned by state (as opposed to federal) review agencies to the award during the grant application process. | varchar(20) |
| CFDA Program Number | The numeric code that indicates the program under which this award was funded within the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA). Numbers that contain AAA, AAB etc. are pseudo-codes and are not in CFDA. | varchar(7) |
| CFDA Program Title | The title of the program under which the award was funded, taken from the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA). | varchar(74) |
| Assistance Category | The original Federal Assistance Awards Data System assistance type code, modified by USAspending.gov into a set of broader categories (direct grants, loans, insurance, etc.) | char(1) |
| Assistance Type | The type of assistance provided by the award: whether it is a grant, cooperative agreement, direct payment, loan, insurance, etc. | char(2) |
| Project Description | A description of the project under which the award is funded. | varchar(149) |

Action

This section shows a detailed action taken under the award -- an amount of money granted or subtracted, the dates involved, the fiscal quarter, and the type of action.

| Data Field | Description | Field Type |
|----------------------------|---|-------------|
| Fiscal Year | The fiscal year in which the award occurred. It may be different from the fiscal year of the award record if the record is a late filing or correction of an amount for a prior fiscal year. Data field added by USAspending.gov. | smallint(6) |
| Fiscal Year / Quarter | The fiscal year and fiscal year quarter for this record, with the first four digits being the year, the fifth the quarter. | varchar(5) |
| Action Type | The type of action for the record: whether it is a new assistance action, a continuation, a revision, or a funding adjustment. | char(1) |
| Federal Funding Amount | Amount of federal government's obligation or contingent liability, in dollars. A negative number represents a decrease in funding. | int(11) |
| Non-Federal Funding Amount | Amount of non-federal funding, in dollars. A negative number represents a decrease in funding. | int(11) |
| Total Funding Amount | The total federal plus non-federal funding amount in dollars. A negative number represents a decrease in funding. | int(12) |
| Obligation / Action Date | Obligation or action date for the award. | date |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|
| Starting Date | The starting date for the award. | date |
| Ending Date | The ending date for the award. | date |
| Record Type | Federal Assistance Awards Data System record type: 1 = county aggregate record, 2 = individual action record | char(1) |
| Correction / Late Indicator | Indicates that the action record is either a correction of a record from a previous quarter or a late reported record from a previous quarter. The previous quarter is indicated in the Corrected Fiscal Year / Quarter data field. | char(1) |
| Corrected Fiscal Year / Quarter | The fiscal year (first four digits) and quarter (fifth digit) of the previous fiscal year and quarter that this record corrects, or which it is a late report for. | varchar(5) |

Principal Place

This section shows the principal place of performance of the activity supported by the award.

| Data Field | Description | Field Type |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Principal Place Code | A code for the principal place of performance for the award. The first two digits are the state FIPS code, the next five the county FIPS (three digits followed by **) or city FIPS code. 00***** = multi-state, 00FORGN = foreign country. | varchar(7) |
| Principal Place State | The state or territory name of the principal place of performance for the award. | varchar(25) |
| Principal Place County or City | The city or county name of the principal place of performance for the award. | varchar(25) |

Janet F. Rosenzweig MS, PhD, MPA Janet_Rosenzweig@ksg08.harvard.edu