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I think we can go ahead and get started. Thanks, everyone. Welcome. We are having a few people that are having trouble getting on, but we are going to go ahead and get started in order to be respectful of people's time.

If we do a quick change partway through, you will know why. So, I want to welcome you to the training on performance measurement for 2021. I'm Elaine Carlson. I’m the co-director of the Center to Improve Program and Project Performance. We are the contractor for OSEP that handles the performance measurement work.

I am joined by a few colleagues, Kerri Wills and Myriell McKinnon, who you will see and hear from later. We will have time for questions at the end, but you can also type your questions in the chat and we will monitor that and try to answer them at the appropriate time during the presentation. Please also note the training is being recorded so that we will have it available if people are unable to attend today.
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So, the purpose of the training is to describe the process of collecting the program measures for OSEP this year and to clarify what is expected from you. We will describe the program GPRA performance measures, suggest ways to enhance the quality of your submissions, and then demonstrate the website that the grantees will use to upload materials. We will review the schedule for the data collection and, of course, we will answer whatever questions you might have.
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So, GPRA requires performance assessment of government programs for purposes of assessing agency performance and improvement. OMB together with the federal agencies determines how the programs will be assessed, and then Congress uses performance assessment data to justify program funding.
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So, how does it work? OSEP reports progress annually to OMB and Congress. That provides an aggregate picture of performance, not for each grant, but for the program overall. And, their review of OSEP's program performance affects continued funding of the IDEA programs. OSEP also uses the funding to improve the TA&D program performance work, so the data are important and are used in a variety of ways.

(Elaine, I believe Susan is here. She might want to join us. You want to jump in, Susan?)

We report the program performance annually, the measures, to Congress and this gives you, gives us an overview of the whole program and how it's performing so that Congress's review of our data does affect the continued funding of our IDEA program.

We use that, so the data are very important to us.
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So, the purpose of the TA&D program, as you may know, sort of the umbrella program over the Deafblind program, is to promote academic achievement and to improve results for children with disabilities by providing technical assistance, supporting model demonstration projects, and disseminating useful information and implementing activities that are supported by scientifically based research.
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So, for this purpose, annual measures are provided to grantees and they report on them as they pertain to quality, relevance, and usefulness. So, this year you will be providing information about the quality, the relevance, and the usefulness of a new service, which involves our collecting data from you in addition to what you provide to OSEP in your APR.
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So, thinking about how is quality rated. What does it mean to have a high-quality product or service? OSEP has determined that there are 2 dimensions for quality; substance and communication. So, the substance dimension is, “Does the product content or the content delivered through the service reflect evidence of conceptual soundness and quality grounded in legislation or policy?”

And the communication dimension is “Is the product content or content delivered through the service presented in such a way so as to be clearly understood as evidence being well organized, free of editorial errors and appropriately formatted.”

An independent panel of reviewers will judge the quality of a product or service by scoring each dimension, these 2 dimensions, substance and communication, on a four-point scale ranging from zero, which is very low, to one, which is moderately low, to 2, moderately high, to 3, very high. In addition, the score for the substance dimension is double weighted, which means services can receive 0, 2, 4, or 6 points for substance. Together the 2 dimensions add up to as many as 9 points, and all scores of 6 and higher are considered high-quality products or services. That's kind of in a nutshell how these are scored by the raters who look at them.
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Moving on to relevance. How is relevant rated and what does it mean to have a highly relevant product or service? We have determined there are 3 dimensions for relevance, and these are need, pertinence, and reach. The need dimension answers the question, “Does the product or content delivered through the service attempt to solve an important problem or deal with the critical issue?” The pertinent dimension is, “Does the product or content delivered through the service address a problem or issue recognized as important by the target audience?” And finally, the reach dimension is, “To what extent is the product or content delivered through the service applicable to the diverse segments of the target audience?”

So, the independent panel of reviewers judges the relevance of the service by scoring each dimension on a four-point scale, very low to very high, and together the 3 dimensions add up to as many as 9 points. Again, all scores of 6 and higher are considered highly relevant.
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Finally, how does usefulness get rated? What does it mean to have a highly useful product or service? OSEP has determined that there are 2 determines for usefulness; ease and suitability. The ease dimension is, “Does the product or content delivered through the service address a problem or issue in an easily understood way with directions or guidance regarding how the content can be used to address the problem or issue?” And then the suitability dimension is, “Does the product or service provide the target audience with information or resources that can be used again or in different ways to address the problem or issue?”

So, the reviewers judge the usefulness of a service by scoring each dimension on a four-point scale ranging from very low to very high. And, in addition, the score for the suitability dimension is double weighted, which means the service can receive either 0, 2, 4, or 6 points for suitability. Together, the 2 dimensions add up to as many as 9 points in all. Scores of 6 or higher are considered highly useful, again.
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So, who participates in the sample? As you know, a random sample of 10 Deafblind projects are selected from the list of projects that were active in fiscal year 21 but did not participate in GPRA reporting in that year. And CIPP draws the random sample and notifies projects of their selection.So, I want to turn it now back to Elaine to talk about the data collection.
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Thanks, Susan. So, this is a quick timeline. So, CIPP first asks projects to upload a list of new services that were first delivered during Fiscal Year 2021, meaning October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021. And that will be uploaded to cippsite.org, which is our website.

We will then randomly select one item from the list, and that is the new service that will be reviewed by the panel.

When developing your list of new services, please remember you don't have to include 10 new services; 10 is just the maximum. And we ask that you focus on listing the major services you released for the first time in Fiscal Year 2021.

Projects upload a description of the selected new service along with any supporting materials, again, to the CIPP website, and a description of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the new service is sent to a stakeholder expert panel for review.
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So, what is a service, is kind of the key question to all of this. A service is defined as work performed by an OSEP project to provide information or assistance to a specific audience on a topic relevant to the improvement of outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.

OSEP recognizes 3 levels of TA services, which I'm sure is familiar to everyone.

The general or universal, targeted or specific, and then intensive or sustained technical assistance. And services can be listed and selected from any of those 3 levels.

So, examples of services. They might include conducting training or providing technical assistance; providing captioning, video description, braille, or other accessible formatting of text or media; leading conventional meetings; or responding to inquiries from a targeted population. We would like to note that for the purposes of performance measurement, maintaining a website is not considered to be a service, so please don't include that on your list.
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The Deafblind projects will develop a new service description guide that the panel will review, and the new service description guide and the supplemental materials that you submit along with it are really important to the GPRA review process, and they really require time and attention.

The guides are the primary source of information consulted by the expert panel in making their quality, relevance, and usefulness ratings. We do encourage you to submit supporting materials along with the guide, but the guide has to stand alone because the panelists are not required to read through the supplemental materials, even though we feel like they usually do. So, when you submit a guide, it has to stand alone. It can't say, for example, see the attached PowerPoint or go to this URL to see the service. It has to be complete in and of itself. That said, we do find that the panelists really do like to have supplemental material, so if you have PowerPoint slides, you can include those. If you have a recording of a webinar, you can include the link.

Projects that submit complete, detailed, and clear guides with supporting materials make it a lot easier for the expert panel to rate the service quality, relevance, and usefulness.

And, based on past reviewer comments, low ratings are almost always a result of inadequate descriptions. If the work is not documented, the panelist is going to assume the work wasn't done. Please keep in mind your project officers and CIPP staff are always willing to have a conversation with you about this work and review drafts of your description guide if that would be helpful.

Thank you for emphasizing that, Elaine. I want to reiterate that we at are OSEP planning to have conversations with each of the sampled grantees on your service description. So rest assured that we are there for you on that process.
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Looking at the next slide, how do I write a good description? First, it requires effort, and we understand and appreciate it. So, these are some tips we have developed over time. Please read the criteria carefully and respond fully and clearly. There are some two-part questions in the description guide and it's very easy to just read the first one and respond to it, so please make sure you are reading the full question and addressing all the component parts.

Guide your reader to the response so it's easy for them to see how your service meets each of the criteria. Share your description with others so they can ask clarifying questions and correct any inadvertent mistakes. Of course, proofread carefully. As you know, mistakes in spelling or grammar can be distracting to the reader and I think just, in general, makes your product stand out as being of high quality if it's carefully written and being free from those types of errors.
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We wanted to give you examples of submissions from prior years that have received positive reviews from the panels. And this is not to suggest that you should write an entry just like this, but what we want to show you is the level of detail that is required in order to receive a positive rating from the panel. So, the first quality dimension pertains to legislation and policy that is driving your service. And so, this is what one panelist wrote, “IDEA requires that each state develop an SPP evaluating its implementation of IDEA and describing how the state will improve such implementation.” “…Indicator C3 and B7 of the SPP/APR requires Part C early intervention and Part B Section 619 preschool special education programs to report on the percentage of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with IFSPs and IEPs who demonstrate improved: 1) Positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships; 2) Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy; and 3) Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.” “States use several different approaches to measure child outcomes, but most utilize the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process…” “This suite of products was designed to support states using the COS process.”

First, they start with the legislation, IDEA. Then they talk specifically about indicator C3 and B7 of the SPP/APR and what the requirements are for those indicators. So, you will see that it's very detailed in terms of making an explicit linkage between the product or service that's being provided and then the legislation, or in this case also the indicators that it's being linked to. Please be explicit to the panel and identify some specific legislation or policy that's driving the service.

For the Deafblind projects, there are also policy letters that can be useful in identifying the specific policy references. Susan, is there a place where we can share these policy letters?

We are actually providing guidance to those selected Deafblind grantees at OSEP and we will send them the link to that policy.

Great. Sometimes that can be really helpful for grantees to have access to those.
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So, the second quality measure pertains to making sure information is clear, and one of the earlier grantees wrote, “…we provided content: 1) in print; 2) in large print; 3) auditorily and visually via Power Point presentation with embedded capability to access the internet (for exhibition of referenced materials); 4) large-group/seminar presentations; 5) small-group and partner discussions and activities…; and 6) opportunities for attendees to approach/question presenters.”

Again, some very detailed information about how they ensure the information was clear.

Another grantee wrote, “…the slide decks for the webinar were reviewed carefully by TA staff and other content experts, including state Part C and Part B 619 staff, as well as OSEP staff. Review by the university’s editing staff was a key strategy for ensuring the information was well-written, clear, and free of errors.”

Finally, a third grantee wrote that “…we provided a basic, concise agenda in language specifically intended for ease of understanding for all attendees, and most especially for parents and families; we provided a table of contents that was intended to expand on the agenda, with program and school staff in mind; and we further expanded the table of contents into timelines. The timelines included approximate age-appropriate activities, assessments and planning tools; identification of key IEP team members and collaboration partners; and explicit goals and outcomes.”
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Okay. So, the next slide addresses relevance, which as you know, they are going to ask does the service that you are describing address important problems?

So, the first relevance measure asked the grantee to show the content of their service does address an important problem or critical issue. One grantee wrote, “Encounters in schools and adult service agencies with DeafBlind individuals and their families reinforced for us the need for a workshop on transition. Because deafblindness is such a low incidence disability, medical practitioners, educational entities, adult service agencies, and members of the general public (including employers), may only rarely (if ever) encounter an individual who is DeafBlind.”

Another Grantee wrote “We carefully considered aspects of transition unique to students who are DeafBlind (such as barriers, essential skills, effective practices, tools, and resources) and designed our robust content accordingly. In short, we considered the diversity among the relatively small numbers of individuals who are DeafBlind, and it was our intent to address and disseminate highly diverse kinds of information and materials that were yet specific to the needs created by deafblindness.”
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So, the 2nd relevance measure asked the grantee how they ensure that the problem or issue is recognized as important. One grantee wrote: “Part C and Part B Section 619 Coordinators consistently rate child outcomes data quality and data use as areas of high need for TA on the Center needs assessments. In addition, the Center receives a large number of TA requests from states related to child outcomes measurement. Since most states use the COS process to collect child outcomes data, the Center often receives TA requests around designing and implementing high-quality comprehensive professional development on the COS process to early intervention and preschool special education practitioners as a strategy for improving the quality of their child outcomes data.”

Finally, “We considered the increasing number of requests for TA in the area of transition from parents as well as state and local entities to be our greatest call to action.”
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The third relevance measure asks the grantee how they ensure content is applicable to diverse audiences. One grantee wrote: “…through our years of work in the Latino community we have identified that we have better response to the …clinics if we: a) advertise well in advance; b) hold them in a center that is identifiable for Latino and Hispanic families c) have an area designed for their children to play near where they are meeting.”

Another Grantee wrote, “…materials were developed with input from a variety of stakeholders. Specifically, input was obtained from parents, researchers, program administrators, direct service providers/practitioners, and training and technical assistance providers...”

Another example is, “Our center “has bilingual staff members to serve families who speak Spanish. We also have connections with various universities and community organizations to provide translation services for our one-on-one planning sessions.”

And finally, “The model of working one-on-one with families is very effective for families who, due to their cultural or preferences, are reluctant to speak up and ask questions in a group setting.”

Next, we will go on to the usefulness slide.
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So, this is the last of the 3 measures and the first usefulness dimension is that grantees are asked to show that the content addresses on problem in an easily understood way that includes instructions on use.

One grantee wrote: “…we asked attendees to keep a specific … child in mind throughout the day while the content was provided, and we asked them to consider how the content being presented could be beneficial to that child. We also provided a series of questions to keep in mind. Our intention was to ensure attendees could more clearly understand ways the material could be used by asking them to envision how it would relate to a particular child.”

Another grantee wrote, “To assist with navigating and using the materials on the webpage, a guidance document was developed describing the various tools and resources in the collection. In addition, guidance on using the materials was provided through a national webinar.”

So, the second usefulness dimension asks grantees to show how the content can be used again. So, one grantee wrote, “…we produce thumb drives …with all of the transition-related information provided during the service. Files on the drive include the three-tiers of the agenda, the table of contents, and the timeline. We encouraged attendees to personalize the drives by adding any additional resources on deafblindness and/or transition for easy future access.”

Finally, “The materials in the workshop packet…can be used as an ongoing reference … to reinforce the information learned at the training. Additionally … an archived recording of the "Tips and Tools" training is available on the website…”

Okay, so again, those examples are not meant to suggest that these are the things you should actually write on your submission, but rather this is the level of detail that the panelists would like to see. If you are writing one sentence in response to one of the questions, that is probably not enough. As you saw, these are typically a paragraph or 2 for each of the prompts.
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The next slide asks, “How do you submit materials?”

Grantees will upload a copy of their completed description guides and supporting materials to CIPPsite.org, our site. Please make sure the URL addresses for your supporting materials are marked clearly, and please limit supporting materials to no more than 5 files per guide. As we said, the panelists really like seeing supporting materials, but they do not want to have to open 30 separate files in order to get through the review. So, we have found that 5 is usually sufficient. The deadline for uploading materials is April 4, and let me show you the timeline here.
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So, the week of February 14 you received notification about your participation.

Obviously, today is March 1 and we are having the training. By March 11 we ask that you upload the list of new services to the CIPP website. Again, that's not a detailed submission.

It's just a list of the new services from which we will sample. The week of March 21, we will notify projects which of those services was selected, and then we will request the detailed service description from you with related documentation or supplemental materials. By April 4, we ask that the project upload their one service description guide along with any supporting materials to the CIPP website.

Okay, so, let me stop for one minute and see if there's any questions in the chat that haven't been answered yet?

Michelle is asking if this morning’s materials have to be submitted by a URL. No, most people are sending attachments. If a URL is easier, but for the most part files being attached is perfectly fine.

Okay, so, I am going to turn the presentation over to Myriell, who was going to do a demonstration of the website and show you how to upload your materials.
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Thank you, Elaine.

I got kicked out, so I can't see back in the chat earlier, but I know there was a question about which center needs to submit a service. I'm not sure if that has been addressed yet.

All of the centers that have been selected are going to submit the service descriptions.

So, and don't worry, any of you that are involved in this year's sampled grantees. We are going to be having a phone call with you to go over a lot of these details and make sure you feel comfortable about the process.

This is Tony from Mississippi project. There was a question earlier in the chat, and I also need that answer, so I thought I would bring it back up. It's, you know, we do often collaborate with each other on services, and so the question previously was about does the service that we submit, the list, have to be ones that we have totally by ourselves in isolation provided as opposed to a collaborative service with another project?

I think that the main issue is if you delivered that service in Fiscal Year 21, you delivered that service obviously. Are you able to go through those questions that the service description is asking and will ask you to look at that, for the elements, quality, relevance and usefulness? Can you answer those questions? Is it grounded in legislation? How do you make sure it's free of editorial errors? What's your process? And so forth. And how did you know this was a need, for example, in your state? Those are the questions about service that are going to be asked that you address. So, as long as you are able to answer those questions about it, there shouldn't be an issue with joint development of the service or supporting materials around the service.

Thank you very much for that. I know that especially since COVID we have had, you know, collaborated even a great deal more for some of these services. And so then it makes me think, well, okay, perhaps there's an activity we can answer those questions very well, but it would still have been in a collaborative way. If another project, one of the collaborators -- that got selected, like randomly got selected as they are service that they had in their list, then our answers might look similar. Is that a problem or should we avoid that at all costs?

Do you understand my question on this one? It's a nuance.

We will ensure that we do not select the same service for two grantees, how is that?

All right, thank you.

Sure.
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Okay. And if we don't have any more questions, I will go ahead and do the presentation portion.

Okay. So, this is the CIPP site. Some of you may be familiar with it, so this is what it looks like when you first get there. The first step you're going to do is go to the login tab.

And so, you will be prompted here to log in, but initially, you need to actually create a unique password, which you will do by clicking on *Forgot password*.

And then that will prompt you to enter your email address, and you're going to use the email address that you're using to communicate with us. Wherever you received the correspondence and the initial email from CIPP, that is the email address we have associated with your account in this system. You will enter that there and click *Send password*. You will receive an email that looks like this and it has some information for you to set up your password. So, just go back to the login page here.

So, again, you're going to use your username, and that's your email. And then for the initial login, the password you're going to use is the password provided in the email that is sent to you from doing that forgot password function. And then you will press *Login*. And that will take you to a page where you're actually prompted to create your own unique password and you'll have to take the criteria here into consideration.

So, for the current password field, you're going to use that same temporary password that you received in the email. And then the following 2 fields you will enter your new password that you will create and you will need to confirm the spelling of that new password. And I conveniently created one here for today's demo purposes.

If you're missing one of the criteria, if it's not at least 12 characters, has an uppercase letter and lowercase that are, special number and a special character, you will get a red error message, so you will just have to make sure that it meets that criteria. Then you will go on to press *Reset password* and you will press *Continue to home page*.

And so, that brings you to the first page of your login. And there are 2 additional tiles here where CIPP provides other services, but the one you will need to access is “Conduct GPRA reporting”, and then you'll navigate through a series of tiles, and we have tailored it to your view so you are basically just seeing the one that is relevant to you, so you can click your way through.

We are going to go to “QRU review”, “QRU review 2022”, “Stakeholder panel”, “TA&D panel documents”, and here you will see 2 folders, the “Guidance documents” folder contains resources relevant to the data collection. When you click there, you will see that there are some forms if you wanted to take a look at those. You will also see the PowerPoint for today's training, and this is where we will also have the recording for today's training.

And you can go back and you’ll get to the “grantee documents” folder, and this is the folder that every grantee needs to access. Once you get there, so, for your group of grants, the folder that pertains to you will be “Deafblind grants”.

And so, here you will see folders that have already been created for you and you will just locate the folder that has your grant number there and your center name there, and then you will click on that to upload first your list of services, and then once we sample that you will also be following the same steps in uploading in your folder your description guide.

Just going to go to the first one as an example. So, when you locate the folder for your grant, you can either drag or drop files in the area here or upload them by pressing the *Upload* button. So, here as an example, I'm going to upload 2 documents, a grant service description guide, and I'm also going to upload grant service document one. So, this is an example of the naming convention that we suggest you to use. It does make it, this is useful for our reviewers when they are reviewing the information just to have the grant there.

When you upload your service descriptions we ask that you label it with your grant number and then service description guide and any supporting materials that you label it your grant number service document one or grant number service document two and so on for however many supporting documents you are uploading to support that service description guide.

And that concludes this portion of the webinar. Do we have any questions about the CIPP site?

Okay. So, I will go ahead and pass it back to Elaine.
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Thanks, Myriell. I know a few other people have entered in the chat that they're having trouble with Internet connections as well. We will have a recording of the webinar available, and then you will also get a hardcopy Quick Start guide for using the SharePoint site. Don't despair. Information will come to you in a variety of forms. Of course, as Susan said, the project officers will be reaching out to answer any questions you have as well.

So, we do have a closing poll question. We want to know what areas you need additional clarification or assistance related to the GPRA process. Do you need help preparing a list of new services? Do you need help with description guides, accessing the website? Or you really don't feel like you need any additional assistance, you feel like you're good to go. And of course, there's “other” if you feel like you have some other need to identify. If you can answer the poll question, we will use the information as we are tailoring our support and outreach to you.

So, I just wanted to give you some faces to go with the names. Myriell and Kerri are the folks behind the emails that you see. Myriell on the right and Kerri on the left. They are more than happy to help you with anything you're working on with regard to the GPRA process. We don't want you to spin your wheels. If you have a question, please reach out to us. It's likely a question we have dealt with many times before and, you know, we want to make this as efficient for you as possible. We know it's burdensome. Many of you have done it time and time again, so we want to make sure that we can really make it as painless as possible.

Susan, do you want to say anything? Sure, I just want to go back to Sherri’s question. Thank you, Sherri, for your question. Why is this timeline so tight? I guess it's March 11 is when you submit your list of services. That's just a list of the new services. That should not be too hard for you to think back to fiscal year 21 and think about the services, but then getting the package together I think is what you're saying is going to take the time. And the deadline is, is it April 8? I don't have it in front of me. But don't worry, the OSEP project office is going to reach out to you and help you think those. That's probably going to take quite a bit of time off on your calendar.

April 4, by the way. Thank you. That will take hopefully some of the stress off and we will work with you to try to review your submission and make sure that everything is there and I think hopefully I know you do have an APR that's coming in in May, but this will be the month prior. Hopefully, you will be able to do it all. I do know it's a busy time of year.

This is Sherri. Just to thank you for that response. I guess it kind of gave me a bit of a heart attack is it said that the CIPP would notify us about which services were selected the week of March 21. I mean, there are 5 days in that week, so if they don't get back to us before the 25th, which is Friday, then we have less than 2 weeks. We have one week basically to submit to get all that together and submit. So, that's really tight.

I agree. If CIPP can get back to us as quickly as possible on that so they know which one to prepare, that would be very helpful. I quite agree that would be desirable to know as quickly as possible which of those products and services that they list are going to be selected.

Of course, if you only had one new one you already know which is going to be selected, but I understand why that's an important thing to do. If they submit them on the 8th, or I guess by the 11th, maybe they can get them back in a week or so.

We will draw the sample as quickly as we get the list, how is that?

That's the thing. If everybody is on time they can draw the sample, but if people are late with that list, that's what holds CIPP up. If you get those in by the deadline, that will be very helpful.

Are there any other questions?

Thank you both so much, all of you for joining us. Once again, expect an email from your OSEP project officer just to reach out, and I want to thank you, Elaine, for bearing with us through this shaky recording session today. If you have any questions, everyone, please reach out to your OSEP project officer as well.

Thank you, Susan. Have a great day, everyone.