



# Uniform Guidance Proposed Updates, Spring 2026

Presented for Maximum, June 11, 2026



**Scott S. Sheffler**

Partner | +1 (202) 805-1994 | [sssheffler@venable.com](mailto:sssheffler@venable.com)

**VENABLE** LLP



Scott S. Sheffler  
Partner  
+1 202.805.1994  
sssheffler@venable.com

With a strategic approach shaped by years of private and federal practice, including service as an attorney within the U.S. Navy and over a decade in private practice supporting federal grantees and contractors, Scott Sheffler brings deep insight to clients facing high-stakes regulatory and funding issues. Scott has more than 15 years of experience advising on federal grant compliance, government procurement law, and internal investigations. He counsels nonprofits, commercial entities, and state and local governments navigating complex federal funding requirements.

# Disclaimer

*The views expressed in this presentation are exclusively those of the presenter, Scott S. Sheffler. They should not be attributed more broadly to Venable LLP or anyone other than Mr. Sheffler.*

# Agenda

1. Nature and Scope of Proposed Updates
2. Oversight
3. Foreign Entity Considerations
4. Routine Grant Administration
5. Fixed Amount Awards
6. Risk Considerations in Award-Making
7. Public Policy Considerations in Award-Making
8. Public Policy Considerations in Grant Performance
9. Termination and Suspension
10. Summary

## Nature and Scope

- Proposed rule issued on May 29, 2026, with a 45-day comment period.
- Thus, comments due on July 13.
- Converts the “Uniform Guidance” implemented separately by individual funding agencies into a “Uniform Grants Regulation.” Agencies may still modify via limited supplementary regulations.
- Approach would more closely mirror the way in which the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) serve as the baseline regulations for all agencies for federal procurements, which agencies then supplement through their own regulations, such as the Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS).
- In practice, agencies already adopt the Uniform Guidance and supplement it via agency-specific regulations, so conversion to a UGR approach on its own will not materially impact grantees.

# Nature and Scope

- Does not address indirect cost rates, despite expectations that it would.
- Despite initial direction via E.O. 14332, Improving Oversight in Federal Grantmaking, for OMB to address indirect cost rate matters in the updates, OMB ultimately did not do so in the proposed rule. According to OMB, this was largely because of congressional intervention on the issue through various legislative efforts and related committee report language.

# Oversight

- 2 C.F.R. § 200.112
- Proposes to add to the conflict of interest requirements at 2 C.F.R. § 200.112 a new provision that will require recipients and subrecipients to disclose “whether any employees who worked on an application for, or proposal in support of, a resulting Federal award, or are anticipated to work on activities under the Federal award, were employed by the awarding Federal agency during the preceding two years prior to application submission.”
- The proposed rule explains this is for “informational [not disqualification] purposes.”

# Oversight

- 2 C.F.R. § 200.113
- Proposes to update the mandatory disclosure provision at 2 C.F.R. § 200.113, which requires the reporting of “credible evidence” of fraud and bribery-related violations of federal law, including civil False Claims Act (FCA) violations, to the cognizant Office of Inspector General (OIG).
- Would now require OIGs to transmit such disclosures to the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia.
- This further emphasizes the current administration’s stated desire to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse.
- Coupled with the inherent ambiguity of what may be perceived as an FCA violation and heightened DOJ focus on the grants system, this expansion has the potential to significantly affect grantees who discover past errors in grant management practices.

# Foreign Entity Considerations

- Proposes a new section 2 C.F.R. § 200.220 establishing a government-wide rule generally prohibiting—unless exempt by statute or by determination of an agency head—recipients and subrecipients from using federal funds to support “a bilateral or multilateral collaboration, agreement, program, or activities with a covered foreign country or covered foreign entity.”
- This prohibition would apply to the use of both direct and indirect funds.
- “Covered foreign country” is defined as (a) “foreign adversary;” (b) “country of particular concern;” or “country subject to sanctions or restrictions relating to national security.”
- “Covered foreign entity” is defined as (a) “[a]n entity owned or controlled by, or acting on behalf of, a covered foreign country;” (b) “[a]n entity identified as an ‘entity of particular concern’ under certain federal agency authorities; or (c) “[a]n entity affiliated with the military, intelligence, or security services of a covered foreign country.”

# Foreign Entity Considerations

- Proposes to add new 2 C.F.R. § 200.202(e) that would prohibit prime research and development awards to “foreign entities,” subject to statutory requirements or agency exceptions based on “compelling interests for the agency’s mission, the administration’s priorities, and for the United States, as determined by the agency’s senior appointee.”
- This change does not propose to limit foreign subrecipients or contractors.

## Routine Grant Administration Impacts

- The proposes a new 2 C.F.R. § 200.202(f), which would encourage the use of multi-year awards with multi-year budgets.
- OMB is proposing revisions to 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.329 and 200.332 that would further emphasize recipients' obligations to report all first-tier subawards valued at \$30,000 or more within SAM.gov (formerly reporting that grantees were to accomplish via the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) Subaward Reporting System (FSRS)).
- Discourages cost-reimbursement contracts under grants, requiring notice to funding agencies when used and encouraging funding agency to consider requiring prior approval for cost-reimbursement contracts.

## Routine Grant Administration Impacts

- Proposes to modify cost principles within Subpart E as follows:
  - 2 CFR § 200.421 (Advertising and PR Costs) would be modified to more broadly assert that public relations and advertising costs are unallowable, whether charged directly or indirectly, with the exceptions only of (a) costs required by statute, (b) advertising related to procurements, (c) advertising related to disposal of scrap or surplus materials, (d) program outreach and “other specific purposes necessary to meet . . . Award requirements.”
  - 2 CFR § 200.450 (Lobbying) would be modified to render unallowable:
    - Costs of voter registration campaigns
    - “Engaging in issue advocacy or public messaging that promotes or opposes a particular social, political, or public policy position unrelated to the statutory objectives or performance requirements of [a] Federal award”
    - “Attempting to influence the executive branch of any State government on matters unrelated to the objectives or performance requirements of [a] Federal award . . .”

## Routine Grant Administration Impacts

- 2 C.F.R. § 200.454 (Members, Subscriptions, and Prof. Activity Costs) would be modified to:
  - Limit allowability of “[c]osts of . . . Membership in professional, civic, business, and technical organizations” to costs “necessary to fulfill . . . award requirements” and require prior approval of all such costs;
  - Render unallowable “[c]osts of . . . subscriptions to business, professional, academic, and technical periodicals . . .”; and
  - Render unallowable “[c]osts of membership in organizations whose primary purpose is lobbying or issue advocacy . . .”
- 2 C.F.R. § 200.461 (Publication and Printing Costs) would be modified to render unallowable “publication costs (including page charges, article processing charges (APCs), or similar fees such as open access fees for professional journal publications and other peer-reviewed publications) . . .”
- 2 C.F.R. § 200.432 (Conferences) would be modified to require prior approval for conference attendance costs.

## Fixed Amount Awards

- Proposes to eliminate fixed amount awards and subawards, except where they are authorized by statute.
- While fixed amount awards are restricted in size and utility under the current version of the Uniform Guidance, such awards provide a less burdensome mechanism for smaller awards and offer the only true path to “payment for performance rather than compliance,” a goal asserted by each of the last three administrations.
- OMB asserts that it “is concerned that the use of this type of award can limit transparency and hinder effective oversight, and believes the limited standards for fixed amount awards in part 200 remain inadequate to address these concerns.”
- While eliminating fixed amount awards, the proposed rule calls for increased use of fixed price contracts by grantees in the purchase of goods or services and “strongly discourages” use cost-reimbursement contracts, requiring notification to funding agencies when using them.

# Risk-Assessment Considerations in Award-Making

- Proposes to modify 2 C.F.R. § 200.206 to add the following considerations to an agency’s risk review:
  - Any “history of questionable practices” (such as plagiarism, discredited studies, unlawful discrimination, or activities inconsistent with religious liberty laws),
  - “[M]embership in or affiliation with organizations engaged in activities that violate Federal law, undermine public safety or national security, or advocate for the overthrow of the [U.S.] Government,” and
  - Compliance with Higher Education Act disclosure requirements regarding foreign gifts.
- This proposed change raises questions as to what constitutes “membership in” or “affiliation with” another organization, and what may be viewed as “undermining public safety or national security.”
- This provision may raise First Amendment concerns to the extent it conditions eligibility on positions taken by applicants outside, and unrelated to, the entity’s grant program activities. *See Agency for International Development v. Alliance for an Open Society*, 570 U.S. 205 (2012).

## Public Policy Considerations in Award-Making

- Proposes to modify 2 C.F.R. § 200.205 to further implement E.O. 14332 by requiring agencies to incorporate a new “pre-issuance review” by “senior appointees” into existing merit review processes for discretionary awards.
- Senior appointees or their designees would be directed to apply several “principles when reviewing Federal award proposals,” including that:
  - “Discretionary awards must, where applicable, demonstrably advance the President’s policy priorities.”
  - Discretionary awards cannot fund, promote or facilitate: (i) racial preferences, (ii) “[d]enial by the recipient of the sex binary in humans or the notion that sex is a chosen or mutable characteristic,” (iii) “[i]llegal immigration, or (iv) “initiatives that compromise public safety or promote anti-American values.”
- Proposes to add to 2 C.F.R. § 200.205 that “[d]iscretionary awards should include benchmarks for measuring success and progress towards relevant goals and, as relevant for awards pertaining to scientific research, a commitment to achieving Gold Standard Science.”

# Public Policy Considerations in Grant Performance

- Proposes to modify 2 C.F.R. § 200.300 to explicitly prohibit use of federal funds:
  - “[T]o fund, promote, encourage, subsidize, or facilitate [DEI] or [DEIA] policies, principles, or practices that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws.”
  - To promote “gender ideology” as defined in E.O. 14168.
  - To fund or promote “[t]he so-called ‘transition’ of a child under 19 years of age from one sex to another, including the chemical and surgical mutilation of children,” as defined in E.O. 14187.
- The proposed revised text does not define which DEI/DEIA activities are unlawful, and OMB:
  - Acknowledges in the preamble to the proposed rule that it “anticipates that some commenters for this rulemaking may contend that the Unlawful DEI Provision is excessively vague or open to misinterpretation,” and
  - Points to the U.S. Department of Justice’s (DOJ) July 2025 memorandum, the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard*, and a December 2, 2025 opinion from the DOJ’s Office of Legal Counsel for guidance.

# Public Policy Considerations in Grant Performance

- Proposes a new 2 C.F.R. § 200.219 that would prohibit *public entities* from restricting event service support based on viewpoint of speaker. Proposes, for private entities, to prohibit use of federal funds for such purposes.
- Proposes a new 2 C.F.R. § 200.218 that would prohibit use of federal funds to implement measures driven by, or further implementing, disparate impact liability considerations/ frameworks.
- Proposes to remove from § 200.300 language interpreting applicability of to *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020). Currently, § 200.300 states: “[i]n administering Federal awards that are subject to a Federal statute prohibiting discrimination based on sex, the Federal agency or pass-through entity must ensure that the award is administered in a way that does not unlawfully discriminate based on sexual orientation or gender identity if the statute's prohibition on sex discrimination encompasses discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity consistent with the Supreme Court's reasoning in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020).”

# Public Policy Considerations in Grant Performance

- Proposes to add to 2 C.F.R. § 200.300, additional language prohibiting federal agencies and pass-through entities from “discriminat[ing] against or in favor of an applicant on the basis of the organization’s religious character, affiliation, exercise, or lack thereof, nor on the basis of conduct that would not be considered ground to favor or disfavor a similarly situated secular organization.”
  - The preamble notes that where religion-based legal protections apply, they require “considering and providing reasonable accommodations or exemptions for religious or conscience-based objections as required by law,” and that “Federal agencies, pass-through entities, recipients, and subrecipients should not structure internal procedures in a way that would require discretionary case-by-case approval of requests for an accommodation or exemption.”
- Within the cost principles, a new 2 C.F.R. § 200.477 would be added, stating: “[c]osts associated with elective abortions are unallowable, except as expressly authorized by Federal law.”

## Grant Termination and Suspension

- Proposes to amend 2 C.F.R. § 200.340 to for agencies to terminate discretionary grants (as compared with grants directed by statute, such as formula grants) on the basis that the funding agency “determines that a termination is in the interest of the Federal agency or pass-through entity, including if a Federal award does not effectuate program goals, Federal agency priorities, or the national interest as they exist at the time of the termination.”
- The proposed texts calls these “discretionary terminations,” and describes them as akin to termination for convenience in federal procurement contracts.
- Proposes to revise 2 C.F.R. § 200.341 to assert that no administrative appeal rights (currently provided under 2 C.F.R. §§ 200.341 and 200.342) for grantees would be required for “discretionary” terminations.”
- Proposes to revise § 200.331 to provide agency authority to direct termination of subrecipients who pose reputational risk to the federal agency.
- Proposes to revise § 200.340 to provide for what seems to be “no cause” suspension of award activities for up to 90 days.

# Summary

The proposed revisions to the Uniform Guidance are substantial. Overall, the proposed updates seem largely designed to:

- Codify administration guidance and revised requirements related to social policy priorities that have been the subject of much attention over the past year;
- Enhance executive agency authority to tailor congressionally authorized programs based on presidential priorities; and
- Enhance executive agency discretion to make funding decisions or terminate funding based upon executive priorities, funded entity foreign relationships, and non-grant-related activities of funded entities that may be perceived as undermining national priorities.
- Comments on the proposed rule are likely to be extensive, and the preamble states that OMB intends to issue a final rule by October 1, 2026.

For additional reference, please see Venable LLP's client alert, available here:

<https://www.venable.com/insights/publications/2026/06/the-administrations-proposed-revisions>

# Questions?



Scott S. Sheffler

Partner

+1 202.805.1994

sssheffler@venable.com

VENABLE<sub>LLP</sub>

VENABLE<sub>LLP</sub>

# Committed to Your Success

As a law firm of more than 900 professionals, Venable delivers legal services globally in every area of regulatory compliance, government affairs, corporate and business transactions, intellectual property, and complex litigation. But no matter the practice, we are united by our passion for the work, all meant to empower you, our client, to be the best version of yourself in any circumstance. Because it's not about us; it's about you – your priorities, your goals, your long list of *what-ifs* that keep you up at night. That's just our to-do list. That's what keeps us focused – your success.

900+

Professionals  
Attorneys and advisors

125+

Years  
A history of strategic growth

15

Offices  
CA | CO | DC | DE | FL | IL | MD | NY | VA



© 2026 Venable LLP.

This document is published by the law firm Venable LLP. It is not intended to provide legal advice or opinion. Such advice may only be given when related to specific fact situations that Venable has accepted an engagement as counsel to address.

**VENABLE** LLP