



U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Financial Assistance Recipient Risk Assessment

FWS Form 3-2462

Instructions

Per the Service's "Risk Assessment Guidance", complete this form once a Fiscal Year (FY) for each recipient to receive one or more awards from the program in the open FY. For each risk category below, enter a numerical rating of "1" (Low), "2" (Medium), or "3" (High) in the corresponding "Rating" box. Use the rating descriptions to assist you in assigning a rating. In the "Basis for Rating and Other Comments" boxes, describe the factors that contributed to the rating assigned. Provide enough detail to give an independent reviewer a clear understanding of the rationale used to determine the rating. Identify any external document(s) that support the rating and specify the location of the document(s), when applicable. For Category 2: Financial Management Capabilities, identify the type of audit report (single, program-specific, independent), the Auditee EIN, and the fiscal period end date for each audit report reviewed to support the risk rating. For Category 7: FAPIIS Review, include the date the FAPIIS search was conducted and a summary statement of the results, *or* print the FAPIIS report and maintain it as an attachment to the completed risk assessment and enter "See attached FAPIIS report". This form will calculate a "Risk Rating Score" and a "Risk Level". If the program determines there are other factors affecting the risk level calculated by the form, enter a description of those in the "Other Factors Impacting Risk Level". Then enter the changed risk level in the "Revised Risk Level" field.

Review Details

Recipient Name:

Recipient Type:

Recipient DUNS:

Completed for Fiscal Year:

Date Completed:

Completed By-Name:

Completed By-Program:

CATEGORY 1: Potential for Implementation Problems

Rating:

Category 1 Rating Descriptions	Rating
Project has no identifiable challenges. No past implementation issues. Typical project period for the program or project type. Well-qualified recipient. Project not complex. No sub-recipients anticipated. Recipient has all equipment required for project.	1 (Low)
New project for recipient. One or more sub-recipients anticipated. Longer than typical project period. Unproven recipient. Has had some issues with implementation on other awards. Some challenges or potential challenges identified, such as recent staff turnover or reorganization that could affect implementation. Does not have all equipment required for the performance of the project but, as noted in its application package, has plans in place to obtain necessary equipment in advance of need.	2 (Medium)
Project has multiple sub-recipients. Complex project. Multiple partners. Large construction project. Has had significant issues with implementation on other awards. Significant challenges identified. Does not have all equipment required. Has not secured resources, which may delay activities.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 1 Rating

CATEGORY 2: Financial Management Capabilities

Rating:

Category 2 Rating Descriptions	Rating
<p>Entity is any type except an individual or for-profit that has received an award from the program in the past. Their Authorized Official has certified by their signature on the standard application form that their financial management system complies with 2 CFR 200 requirements. Entity had no financial management issues on past awards. They may also be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to Uniform Guidance Audit for which their most recently completed audit available on the Federal Audit Clearinghouse resulted in an Unmodified Opinion and did not contain any of the following: “going concern” emphasis-of-matter paragraph, significant deficiency, material weakness, material noncompliance, or any Standard Form Single Audit Compliance (SF-SAC) types of compliance findings, or • Not subject to Uniform Guidance Audit, whose most recently completed publicly available independent audit resulted in an Unqualified Opinion, or • Receiving funding under a program subject to Federal statute or regulation prescribing other audit requirements and the program determines a low rating based on the results of their most recently completed audit. 	1 (Low)
<p>Entity is the same as described above, but had financial management issues on past award(s) from the program. Entity was responsive to FWS communications on those and they were resolved to the Service’s satisfaction. They may also be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to Uniform Guidance Audit for which their most recently completed audit available on the Federal Audit Clearinghouse resulted in a Qualified Opinion and contained any of the following unrelated to any FWS program: a “going concern” emphasis-of-matter paragraph, significant deficiency, material weakness, material noncompliance, or any SF-SAC types of compliance findings. • Not subject to Uniform Guidance Audit, whose most recently completed publicly available independent audit resulted in a Qualified Opinion. • Receiving funding under a program subject to Federal statute or regulation prescribing other audit requirements and the program determines a medium rating based on the results of their most recently completed audit. 	2 (Medium)
<p>Is an individual. Is a for-profit entity. Is a non-Federal entity whose Authorized Official has certified by their signature on the standard application form that their financial management system complies with 2 CFR 200 requirements, and either has never received an award or had significant funds management issues on past awards from the program. Such issues may include routinely submitting incorrect financial reports, requesting funds in advance in excess of immediate cash needs, major variances between budgeted and actual costs, difficulty maintaining required match, or charging unallowable costs. Entity may have been slow to respond to FWS communications on those and one or more concerns may remain unresolved. They may also be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to Uniform Guidance Audit for which their most recently completed audit available on the Federal Audit Clearinghouse resulted in an Adverse or Disclaimer of Opinion and contained any of the following related to any FWS program: a “going concern” emphasis-of-matter paragraph, significant deficiency, material weakness, material noncompliance, or any SF-SAC types of compliance findings. • Not subject to Uniform Guidance Audit, whose most recently completed publicly available independent audit resulted in an Adverse or Disclaimer of Opinion. • Receiving funding under a program subject to Federal statute or regulation prescribing other audit requirements and the program determines a high rating based on the results of their most recently completed audit. 	3 (High)

Basis for Category 2 Rating

CATEGORY 3: Performance Track Record

Rating:

Category 3 Rating Descriptions	Rating
Met all proposed objectives on past award(s). Any delays or non-performance were unavoidable; is on track to meet objectives on current award(s).	1 (Low)
Had some performance delays or other issues on past award(s) but was responsive to FWS communications on issues. Issues were resolved.	2 (Medium)
Has had no past or current award with the FWS. Has had a past award but failed to complete project objectives. Is significantly behind schedule on current award(s). Failures are within recipient's control to correct. Failed to comply with award terms and conditions. Was not responsive to FWS communications. Issues were never resolved.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 3 Rating

CATEGORY 4: Staffing

Rating:

Category 4 Rating Descriptions	Rating
Recipient is an individual. Recipient provided details on experience and qualifications of key project personnel. All personnel appear qualified to meet the project objectives. No past issues with recipient in regards to key personnel qualification. No key project personnel missing.	1 (Low)
Recipient provided information detailing the experience and qualifications for some key project personnel. All of the identified personnel appear qualified to meet the project objectives, but missing some key project personnel.	2 (Medium)
Recipient has not yet identified/hired any key project personnel; one or more of the personnel identified do not appear qualified to meet the project objectives; or one or more key personnel left the project and replacement(s) have not been identified.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 4 Rating

CATEGORY 5: Delivery Experience

Rating:

Category 5 Rating Descriptions	Rating
Has delivered the same or similar project with Federal funds for at least five years.	1 (Low)
Has delivered the same or similar project with Federal funds for at least two years.	2 (Medium)
Has delivered the same or similar project with Federal funds for less than two years or has never had a Federal award.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 5 Rating

CATEGORY 6: Award Administration and Reporting Compliance

Rating:

Category 6 Rating Descriptions	Rating
Has never received an award from the program. Has had an award, and was timely in submission of revision and other prior approval requests, required reporting, and due date extension requests, when applicable	1 (Low)
Has had an award, and was generally timely in submission of revision and prior approval requests, required reporting, and due date extension requests. Was responsive to written notifications and requests from the FWS.	2 (Medium)
Has had an award, and was consistently late in in submission of revision and prior approval requests, required reporting, and due date extension requests. Was slow to respond to written notifications and requests from the FWS.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 6 Rating

CATEGORY 7: Integrity and Performance System (FAPIS) Review

Rating:

Category 7 Rating Descriptions	Rating
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Federal share will not exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$250,000). FAPIS review not required, orFederal share of the award will exceed \$250,000 over the life of the award. FAPIS report regarding the intended recipient and any immediate highest-level owner, predecessor, or subsidiary identified for the entity in FAPIS contained no information reflecting an unsatisfactory record of performance or integrity and business ethics.	1 (Low)
Federal share will exceed \$250,000 over the life of the award. FAPIS report indicates a less than satisfactory record of performance or integrity and business ethics but the program has determined is not relevant to the award under consideration.	2 (Medium)
Federal share will exceed \$250,000 over the life of the award. FAPIS report indicates a less than satisfactory record of performance or integrity and business ethics that is relevant to the award under consideration but the program can mitigate those by imposing one or more specific conditions to the award per 2 CFR §200.208. Note: If the program determines the entity is no longer eligible to receive the award <i>based only on the information found in FAPIS</i> , stop the risk assessment (do not assign a rating to this category), document the decision below, and see the Service's "Risk Assessment Guidance" for further instructions.	3 (High)

Basis for Category 7 Rating

RISK RATING SCORE:

RISK LEVEL:

Other Factors Impacting Risk Level

REVISED RISK LEVEL: