

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Request for Proposals to Develop Standards for Environmentally Preferable Electronic Products

Sponsoring Agency and Offices: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

Funding Opportunity Title: Request for Proposals to Develop Standards for Environmentally Preferable Electronic Products

Action: Request for Proposals

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 66.717

Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-01

Proposal Submission Deadlines: Dates: Proposals may be submitted in hard copy or by electronic format. All hard copy proposals packages must be postmarked by June 30, 2011 in order to be considered for funding. For applicants submitting hardcopy proposals via express delivery (such as UPS, FedEx, etc.), the date on the waybill will serve as the postmark. **Electronic submissions must be submitted via <http://www.grants.gov> by June 30, 2011, 11:59 P.M. ET.** Late proposals will not be considered for funding. **Questions must be submitted in writing via e-mail and must be received by the Agency Contact identified in Section VII before May 16, 2011, 11:59 P.M. ET. Please refer to Section IV, Parts A and C for more information.**

SUMMARY OF ANNOUNCEMENT

1. Introduction: EPA is seeking proposals from eligible organizations to support research, studies, training and technical assistance necessary to develop two voluntary consensus standards that will be published as American National Standards for environmentally preferable electronic products using a standards process accredited by the American National Standards Institute.

2. Funding and Awards: EPA anticipates awarding one cooperative agreement under this announcement. Total funding is anticipated to be approximately \$500,000 for a total project period of four years. EPA expects that this agreement will be incrementally funded. Phase 1 will provide approximately \$250,000 of Federal funds for approximately 2 years to support the development of environmental performance standards for servers. Phase 2 will provide approximately \$250,000 of Federal funds for another approximately 2-year period to support the development of environmental performance standards for another electronic product category. Funding for proposals is subject to the quality of proposals received and the availability of funds. Continued funding will be subject to satisfactory performance and availability of funds.

3. Eligible Applicants: Eligible applicants include the fifty states, the District of Columbia, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, local governments, city or township governments, independent school districts, incorporated nonprofit organizations (other than institutions of higher education), public and private

institutions of higher education, community-based grassroots incorporated non-profit organizations, and Federally-recognized tribes and Intertribal Consortia.

Individuals, for-profit businesses and nonprofit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 are **ineligible** to apply for funding.

This Request for proposals includes the following information:

Section I.	Funding Opportunity Description
Section II.	Award Information
Section III.	Eligibility Information
Section IV.	Proposal Submission Information
Section V.	Proposal Review Information
Section VI.	Award Administration Information
Section VII.	Agency Contact
Section VIII.	Other Information
Appendix A	Instructions for Applying through Grants.gov
Appendix B	Sample Cover Page

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Introduction

The development of the IEEE 1680 family of standards was prompted by a growing demand by purchasers for an easy-to-use evaluation tool that allows the comparison and selection of electronic products based on environmental performance. Purchasers are increasingly interested in using procurement policies to reward the design and manufacture of electronic products that pose fewer environmental risks. Until the development of the IEEE 1680 standards, these "green" procurement initiatives were largely uncoordinated and often did not take a life cycle approach to the environmental impacts posed by electronic products. Manufacturers were frustrated by the proliferation of complex and conflicting policies and environmental evaluation criteria. In addition, purchasers did not have the resources or technical expertise to develop and evaluate complex environmental information.

The electronics industry welcomed and actively participated in the development of the IEEE 1680 standards and envisioned these standards as a way to communicate relevant and meaningful information to purchasers about the environmental impacts posed by electronic products. The IEEE 1680 standards have been a huge success: as of February 2011, 45 manufacturers, registered in 41 countries, had registered more than 3,200 products under the IEEE 1680-2006 Standard for the Environmental Assessment of Personal Computer Products, including Laptop Personal Computers, Desktop Personal Computers, and Personal Computer Monitors and purchasers had required products to meet these standards in more than \$42 billion in RFPs and contracts.

Based on the results of the previous standards development activities, the EPA has determined that providing financial assistance for research, studies, training and technical assistance to support developing standards for environmentally preferable electronic products is in the public interest. EPA's primary goal is to develop credible voluntary consensus standards for these products that will gain significant market acceptance by manufacturers and purchasers.

B. Program History

A multi-stakeholder workgroup developed the IEEE 1680 standards through a consensus decision-making process whose facilitation was funded by EPA. The result of this process was: 1) the IEEE 1680 Standard for the Environmental Assessment of Electronic Products, which describes how to demonstrate that a product is in conformance with any standard in the IEEE 1680 family of standards, and 2) the IEEE 1680.1 Standard for the Environmental Assessment of Personal Computer Products, which includes a set of environmental performance criteria for computer desktops, laptops, and monitors. These standards: IEEE 1680 and IEEE 1680.1 were developed through a process accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), which assures openness, stakeholder balance, and due process. The final IEEE 1680 standard was published in April 2006. A revision of the 1680-2006 standard was issued December 9, 2009. It was divided into two standards, which are identified as IEEE standard 1680-2009 and IEEE standard 1680.1-2009.

Launched in 2006, EPEAT®, which stands for: Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool, was developed in response to growing demand by institutional purchasers for an easy-to-use evaluation tool enabling them to compare electronic products based on environmental performance, in addition to cost and performance considerations. Creation of EPEAT® was guided by electronics manufacturers' expressed need for clear, consistent procurement criteria.

EPA awarded funding to the Green Electronics Council (GEC) to conduct research, studies, training, and public education concerning the creation of a registry for certain electronic products found to be in conformance with the IEEE 1680 family of standards. EPEAT® was developed under that grant and is used to inform purchasers of the environmental criteria of electronic products. As of July 2007, GEC had conducted studies necessary to register more than 400 products from 20 manufacturers. All product registration and verification functions for existing and new standards in the IEEE 1680 family of standards will be conducted as outlined in the IEEE 1680 Standard and will not be the responsibility of the recipient of this grant.

At this time, EPA no longer funds GEC. GEC, through its affiliate EPEAT, Inc. runs a registry and product verification system and markets this registry to purchasers with funding received via subscriber registration fees. It does so independently of the Federal government, and GEC does not act on behalf of EPA. EPEAT Inc. has developed criteria for selecting standards that products must meet to be included on the EPEAT Product Registry. For more information about GEC/EPEAT, Inc. and how the current registration and verification program is organized and run, see <http://www.epeat.net>.

Given the success of these standards in driving the market toward manufacture and procurement of environmentally preferable electronic products, stakeholders have expressed to EPA their interest in adding additional electronic products to the system.

In July 2007 the Zero Waste Alliance published the “EPEAT Standard Development Roadmap” (EPEAT SDR), which provides a recommended path forward for development of voluntary consensus standards for electronic products that are parallel and compatible with the other standards in the IEEE 1680 standards. The EPEAT SDR project gathered input from interested stakeholders on:

- Which electronic products are the highest priority for the development of new environmental leadership standards.
- Groupings of products for environmental performance standards development.
- Sequence and method of environmental performance standard development.
- Issues that need to be considered both in the prioritization and the actual standards development.

The recommendations from the EPEAT SDR project are described below. However, the sequencing of the development of these standards may be subject to change, based on stakeholder input and availability of funding. To see the full recommendations of the EPEAT SDR project go to: http://www.zerowaste.org/epeat/roadmap_files/SDR_Final_Roadmap_070824.pdf

1. Develop standards for four new sets of products in the following sequence:

a. Imaging Devices (printers, copiers and multifunction devices)

b. Televisions and Television Monitors

It was proposed that the standards for these two product categories be developed first.

c. Servers

Development of a standard for servers is proposed to begin following the completion of the ENERGY STAR® standard for servers.

d. Mobile Devices (mobile phones, personal digital assistants, and SmartPhones)

Development of a standard for mobile devices was proposed to begin following the completion of the standards development process for imaging devices and/or televisions.

2. Method of standard development.

The future voluntary consensus standards should be developed through an ANSI accredited process.

3. Timing of standards development.

The standards should be developed in a staggered fashion over the next five years.

In May 2008, EPA awarded cooperative agreement #83387801 to the University of Tennessee (UT). This agreement supported facilitation and the development of criteria being used to develop standards for the electronic product categories 1a. and 1b. in the SDR (above). This RFP will address development of a standard for servers, 1c. in the EPEAT SDR.

Work is currently underway to finalize these standards: IEEE 1680.2 Standard for the Environmental Assessment of Imaging Equipment and the IEEE 1680.3 Standard for the Environmental Assessment of Televisions, following an ANSI accredited process. EPA will make data and other materials UT produced under the cooperative agreement available to the successful applicant for funding under this announcement. Information on the IEEE standard development process, the IEEE 1680 standards, and the IEEE 1680 Workgroup Policies and Procedures can be found at www.epeatdevelopment.net.

C. Goal of this Announcement

EPA is seeking proposals from eligible organizations to support research, studies, training and technical assistance necessary to develop two voluntary consensus standards for environmentally preferable electronic products via an ANSI accredited **standards development organization (SDO)**.

The first standard will address the electronic product: servers. A second standard will address a different electronic product category, to be determined by the cooperative agreement recipient in consultation with stakeholders and EPA. EPA anticipates that the process and costs to develop the server standard will be similar to the costs to develop the second electronic product category standard. The final decision on the second product category will be made by the recipient in consultation with EPA.

Applicants must work with stakeholders to develop two voluntary consensus environmental performance standards via an ANSI accredited SDO. The development of environmentally preferable standards for electronic products would be in two phases lasting approximately two years each.

Phase 1 will cover the process to develop environmental performance standards for servers. In addition, in Phase 1 only, the recipient will identify candidates for the next 3 to 5 categories of electronic products that should be considered for developing new standards. The recipient should build on the work of the EPEAT SDR (http://www.zerowaste.org/epeat/roadmap_files/SDR_Final_Roadmap_070824.pdf), considering these two attachments to the EPEAT Roadmap: Attachment 1, “SDR Evaluation Considerations Table and Attachment 3, “Full List of Electronic Products Considered in the SDR Process”. The recipient should anticipate consultation with stakeholders, including industry, retailers, institutional purchasers, and other affected parties.

Phase 2 will begin once the first set of standards for servers is completed and the next categories of electronic products have been proposed. Phase 2 will focus on development of environmental performance standards for a second electronic product category. Because the second electronic product category is unknown, applicants should estimate the level of effort based on the process outlined for Phase 1.

Proposals must clearly describe the tasks and milestones in developing voluntary consensus standards using an ANSI accredited standards development organization. For both Phase 1 and Phase 2 the recipient will be expected to:

1. Develop a voluntary consensus based standard for an electronic product via an ANSI accredited standards development organization. Proposals must describe distinct tasks and milestones for the standards development process. Examples of tasks that must be included are: conduct research and studies to identify stakeholders; facilitate and support meetings to gather information, provide training or technical assistance; ensure ongoing coordination among stakeholders; conduct technical research of existing environmental standards, and lead or facilitate standards development.

Applicants must describe how they will engage the full range of stakeholders and their technical expertise to support identification and development of environmental criteria, characteristics or other elements that will support the standards development process. Applicants must describe how they will track progress and the milestones for the development of the environmental performance standard.

Applicants must clearly demonstrate how they will effectively manage their tasks and indicate what means will be used to ensure ongoing coordination among stakeholders. Some activities the recipient could perform include: regular teleconference calls and webinars, creative use of technological tools (such as Survey Monkey®, WebEx, etc.), occasional face-to-face meetings of stakeholders at key decision points. Applicants must demonstrate their skills and experience in conducting research and studies, providing training and technical assistance to facilitate group decision making, managing complex processes, and engaging multiple stakeholders. Applicants must demonstrate their understanding and experience with ANSI accredited standards development procedures in order to ensure an open, fair, and consistent process.

2. Provide technical and research support for criteria development by standards workgroups. The recipient must provide technical and research support throughout the development of the environmental performance standard. This may include, but is not limited to, tasks such as: background research on existing standards or identifying stakeholders to help solve specific technical issues. Research should identify all existing environmental performance based standards or sets of criteria being used in the marketplace internationally for the product for which the workgroup is developing criteria. EPA will provide information regarding previous IEEE 1680 standards development activities.

Applicants are encouraged to review the IEEE 1680 Umbrella Standard that provides basic content requirements for any standard in the IEEE 1680 standards, and the EPEAT Standards Selection Criteria for inclusion in the EPEAT Product Registry.

3. Estimate potential impact and benefits of the new standard. The recipient must identify and estimate outcomes resulting from the implementation of the standard. More information on the types of outcomes is described in Section I.D.2.

EPA seeks to promote the availability and use in the marketplace of environmental performance standards. In the EPEAT Standards Development Roadmap, stakeholders – including purchasers and manufacturers - expressed strong interest in harmonizing electronics standards under IEEE 1680. IEEE may or may not be the relevant SDO for the resulting criteria developed under this assistance agreement; however, applicants must demonstrate how the criteria or elements resulting from this work will build upon the successful development of sustainability standards for electronics under IEEE 1680 and the EPEAT registry. Information on the IEEE standard development process, the IEEE 1680 standards, and the IEEE 1680 Workgroup Policies and Procedures can be found at www.epeatdevelopment.net.

D. EPA Grant Requirements

1. Statutory authority.

Grants under CFDA 66.717 will be awarded using the following statutory authorities as appropriate: Clean Air Act, Section 103(b), as amended; Clean Water Act, Section 104(b)(3), as amended; Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, Section 20, as amended; Safe Drinking Water Act, Section 1442 (a)(1) and (c), as amended; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Section 8001(a), as amended; and Toxic Substances Control Act, Section 10, as amended. Projects must consist of activities within the statutory terms of these EPA grant authorities.

These statutes authorize assistance agreements for the following activities: “research, investigations, experiments, training, and demonstration of new or innovative techniques, surveys and studies.” Studies and training may include technical assistance. This assistance agreement will support activities related to gathering and transferring information regarding the environmental impact of the manufacture, use and disposal of two categories of electronic products and developing standards based on that information.

2. Link proposed work plan to EPA Strategic Plan and outcomes.

It is EPA policy to link proposed assistance agreements to the Agency’s Strategic Plan and ensure that outputs and outcomes are appropriately addressed in proposed work plans and performance reports. EPA requires that grant recipients adequately describe environmental outputs and environmental outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements (see EPA Order 5700.7, Environmental Results Under Assistance Agreements (<http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700.7.pdf>)).

a) Proposals must support the Agency’s strategic plan which identifies measurable environmental and human health outcomes the public can expect over the next five years. EPA’s 2006-2011 Strategic Plan’s Goal 5 includes Pollution Prevention under Objective 5.2: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Other Stewardship Practices. (For more information, go to: <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>.) The specific environmental outcomes for this sub-objective include: reductions in pounds of hazardous materials; reduction, conservation or offset of British Thermal Units (BTUs); reductions in gallons of water used; and dollars saved through pollution prevention improvements in businesses. Some of the strategic measures in the Agency Plan are

included as measures in the Pollution Prevention Program Strategic Plan mentioned in Section I.B. 2.

b) Proposals must support the Pollution Prevention Program Strategic Plan. This RFP reflects activities described in the “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 2010-2014 Pollution Prevention Program Strategic Plan” (posted at <http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/p2home/pubs/docs/P2StrategicPlan2010-14.pdf>). The proposed activities of this grant program will support the electronics sector pollution prevention strategy because these activities will result in reductions in the use of hazardous materials, toxic chemicals, energy, water, and raw materials throughout the electronics life cycle, as well as reductions in greenhouse gas and other emissions, solid waste, hazardous waste, and risks from improper handling of obsolete electronic products.

c) Anticipated outcomes and outputs are required in all proposals. Grant proposals must include project milestones specifying the outcomes and outputs that will result, and a clear description of the method(s) the recipient will use to track and measure progress in achieving the expected outcomes and outputs associated with each project milestone.

i) Environmental outputs. The term "output" means an activity, effort and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal or objective that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period.

Examples of expected output measures to be achieved under the agreement awarded through this announcement include, but are not limited to:

- Number of proposed criteria for the electronic product standard,
- Number of responses to requests for technical assistance,
- Number of meetings facilitated,
- Number of stakeholders and stakeholder groups involved in the process, and
- Research reports and studies produced.

ii) Environmental outcomes. The term "outcome" means the result, effect, or consequence that will occur from carrying out an activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health related or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period.

Examples of expected outcome measures to be achieved under the agreement awarded through this announcement include, but are not limited to:

- Standards that result in measurable reductions in an electronic product's energy use, use of toxics, waste generated at end of life, and materials used in manufacturing and packaging, and
- Estimates of quantified environmental benefits resulting from purchases of products that meet the standards, including pounds of hazardous materials

reduced, pounds of other pollutants reduced, metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent reduced, gallons of water saved, and costs saved by businesses, institutions, individuals and governments (observed and/or estimated).

d) Utilize a Quality Assurance Protocol. EPA assistance agreement recipients must implement or have implemented a quality system conforming to the American National Standard ANSI/ASQC E4-1994, Specifications and Guidelines for Quality Systems for Environmental Data Collection and Environmental Technology Programs. This quality system shall be applied to all environmental programs within the scope of the assistance agreement. Environmental programs include direct measurements or data generation, environmental modeling, compilation of data from literature or electronic media, and data supporting the design, construction, and operation of environmental technology. For more information see: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/assurance.htm>.

The recipient of this assistance agreement must submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) prepared in accordance with the specifications provided in EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans (QA/R-2) (EPA 2001) (see <http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qmps.html>), or documentation determined by EPA to be equivalent.

Applicants for this grant program are not required to submit a Quality Management Plan (QMP) as part of the proposal package. The assistance agreement will have a term and condition that requires the recipient to submit the QMP within a specified time after award of the agreement and notifies the recipient that they may not begin work involving environmental programs until the EPA Project Officer informs them that the QMP has been approved. The QMP shall be reviewed and approved by the EPA Project Officer and the EPA Quality Assurance Manager (or designee).

The Assistance Agreement will also require the recipient to submit Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) to EPA for review and approval by the EPA Project Officer and EPA Quality Assurance Manager before undertaking any work involving environmental measurements or data generation. QAPPs shall be prepared using EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/R-5) (EPA 2001) (see <http://www.epa.gov/quality1/qapps.html>). Approval of the recipient's QMP by the EPA Project Officer and the EPA Quality Assurance Manager, may allow delegation of the authority to review and approve Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) to the recipient based on procedures documented in the QMP.

II. AWARD INFORMATION

A. Amount of Funding Available

Approximately \$500,000 in Federal funds will be awarded to one applicant through a cooperative agreement under this competition announcement.

EPA expects that this agreement will be incrementally funded. Phase 1 will provide approximately \$250,000 of Federal funds for approximately 2 years to support the development of environmental performance standards for servers. Phase 2 will provide approximately \$250,000 of Federal funds for another approximately 2-year period to support the development of environmental performance standards for another electronic product category. Funding for Phase 2 will depend upon performance of Phase 1, the availability of funding, and other applicable considerations.

Applicants should submit a work plan and budget encompassing both phases for the full \$500,000 of Federal funds over a period of four years. Funding for proposals is subject to the quality of proposals received and the availability of funds. EPA will award continued funding for the second phase subject to satisfactory performance, the availability of funds, and Agency priorities.

B. Number of Agreements EPA will Award in this Competition

One cooperative assistance agreement will be awarded. **EPA reserves the right to reject all proposals and make no awards under this competition.**

C. Partial Funding

In appropriate circumstances, EPA reserves the right to partially fund proposals by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund a proposal, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice any applicants or affect the basis upon which the proposal or portion thereof was evaluated and selected for award, and therefore maintains the integrity of the competition and selection process.

To be considered for partial funding, the applicant's work plan must have clearly delineated tasks that include separate budget estimates for each task or phase of the project. The completed proposal package must include a budget that estimates the costs for labor (by labor category), fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractors, and for other direct costs and indirect costs. The budget must itemize these costs under each task identified in the work plan as well as for the entire proposed project.

D. Project Period for Awards Resulting from this Solicitation

The project period for this award is up to four years (48 months), depending on the quality of the proposal and performance in the first year after the award. The award will be made in early FY 2012, depending on Congressional appropriations for this program, the quality of proposals received, and other applicable considerations.

E. Funding Type

EPA will issue the award in the form of a cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement is an assistance agreement that is used when there is substantial Federal involvement with the recipient during the performance of an activity or project. EPA awards cooperative agreements for those projects in which it expects to have substantial interaction with the recipient throughout the

performance of the project. EPA will negotiate the precise terms and conditions of “substantial involvement” as part of the award process.

Federal involvement for this project may include: close monitoring of the recipient’s performance; collaboration during the performance of the scope of work, such as: forming stakeholder groups or coordination of the standards development process; in accordance with 40 CFR 30.44(e) or 31.36(g), as appropriate, review of proposed procurements; reviewing qualifications of key personnel; review and comment on the content of printed or electronic publications prepared; and review and approval of Phase 1 deliverables prior to starting work on Phase 2. EPA does not have the authority to select employees or contractors employed by the recipient. The final decision on the content of reports rests with the recipient.

Please note that the recipient will not be providing services or products for EPA’s direct use or benefit and, consequently, the recipient will make the final decisions on the process for developing the environmental performance standards for the two electronic product categories via an ANSI accredited SDO. Award of funding through this year’s competition is not a guarantee of future funding.

III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants include the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, local governments, city or township governments, independent school districts, incorporated non-profit organizations (other than institutions of higher education), public and private institutions of higher education, incorporated community-based grassroots non-profit organizations, and Federally-recognized Indian Tribes that meet the requirement for treatment in a manner similar to a State in 40 CFR 35.663 and Intertribal Consortia that meet the requirements in 40 CFR 35.504.

Note: Eligible non-profit organizations must be able to demonstrate their non-profit status with appropriate documentation by the time of award.

Individuals, for-profit businesses and non-profit organizations described in Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that engage in lobbying activities as defined in Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 are ineligible to apply for funding.

B. Cost Sharing and Matching Requirements

EPA requires the applicant to provide a minimum 5 percent match, as part of the total allowable project cost, in order to receive an award. For example, the Federal government will provide 95 percent of the total allowable cost of the project and the recipient will provide the remaining 5 percent. The match may be issued in the form of cash and/or in-kind contributions, e.g., donated services, charges for real property and equipment or the value of goods and services directly benefiting the EPA funded project.

Proposals that do not describe how the 5 percent match requirement will be met will not be reviewed. Award recipients must comply with 40 CFR 30.23 or 40 CFR 31.24 as applicable when meeting the cost share requirement.

The match requirement may be applied at the time of award or at specified intervals during the project period. The grant applicant must document in the itemized budget plan the type of match to be applied and how it will be used. EPA's grant project officer will monitor the grant recipient's compliance with the match requirement. If recipient does not meet the match requirement Federal funding may cease and the recipient may be held liable for all costs the recipient charged to the grant agreement.

C. Funding Restrictions

Proposals must not request more than a total of \$500,000 in Federal funds. Proposals should outline tasks in two phases: Phase 1 with a budget of up to \$250,000 of Federal funds and Phase 2 with a budget of up to \$250,000 Federal funds. EPA assistance agreement funds may only be used for the purposes set forth in the assistance agreement and must be consistent with the designated statutory authorities of CFDA 66.717. Assistance agreement funds may not be used for lobbying, or intervention in Federal regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Recipients may not use EPA grant funds to match other grant funds unless the other Federal agency has statutory authority to allow that practice. In addition, Federal funds may not be used to sue the Federal government or any other government entity. All costs identified in the budget must conform to applicable Federal cost principles contained in OMB Circular A-87 (codified at 2 CFR Part 225); A-122 (codified at 2 CFR Part 230); and A-21 (codified at 2 CFR Part 220), as appropriate. EPA will subtract proposed ineligible costs from the final approved budget if a cooperative agreement is awarded.

D. Threshold Eligibility Criteria

Proposals must meet the following requirements by the time of submission or they will be eliminated from consideration for funding. Only proposals that meet all of these criteria will be evaluated against the ranking factors in Section V of this announcement. **Applicants deemed ineligible for funding consideration as a result of the threshold eligibility review will be notified within 15 calendar days of the submission deadline.**

- 1. Proposals must describe how the applicant will achieve the key goals outlined** in Section I.C above.
- 2. Proposals must be from an eligible applicant** as defined in Section III.A.
- 3. Proposals must indicate how the applicant will meet the 5% cost share** requirement as described in Section III.B.
- 4. Proposals must not ask for more than \$500,000** in Federal funds as described in Section II.A.

5. Proposals must only include activities eligible for funding under the statutory authorities listed in Section I.D.1. These statutes authorize grants for: “research, investigations, experiments, training, and demonstration of new or innovative techniques, surveys and studies.” Studies and training may include technical assistance. This grant will support activities related to gathering or transferring information regarding the environmental impact of the manufacture, use and disposal of specific electronic product categories to support development of environmental criteria and characteristics that will be submitted to a standards development organization.

6. Proposals must specify outputs and outcomes as described in Section I.D.2 and link these outcomes to the Agency Strategic Plans also described in Section I.D.2.

7. Threshold submission requirements:

a) Proposals must substantially comply with the proposal submission instructions and requirements set forth in [Section IV](#) of this announcement or they will be rejected. If the project narrative exceeds the page limit expressed in Section IV, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed.

b) Proposals must be submitted for delivery (as shown on receipt or waybill), postmarked or received through via <http://www.grants.gov>, on or before the proposal submission deadline published in Section IV of this announcement. Applicants are responsible for ensuring that their proposal reaches the designated person/office specified in Section IV of the announcement by the submission deadline.

Proposals postmarked or received by <http://www.grants.gov> after the submission deadline will be considered late and returned to the sender without further consideration unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it was late due to EPA mishandling. For hardcopy, where Section IV.C.1 requires proposal receipt by a specific person/office by a submission deadline, receipt by the Agency mailroom is not sufficient. Applicants should confirm receipt of their proposal with the contact indicated in Section VII as soon as possible after the submission deadline, failure to do so may result in your proposal not being reviewed.

IV. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION

The following section describes how to submit a grant proposal, including submission dates, proposal submission methods, and proposal content. Applicants are advised to carefully read through these instructions.

A. How to Obtain Proposal Package

Applicants may download individual grant proposal forms from EPA's Office of Grants and Debarment website at: http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/how_to_apply.htm. To obtain a hard copy of materials, please send an email or written request to the Agency contact listed in [Section VII](#) of this announcement.

B. Submission Dates and Times

All hard copies of proposals packages must be postmarked by June 30, 2011, in order to be considered for funding. For applicants submitting hardcopy proposals via express delivery (such as UPS, FedEx, etc.), the date on the waybill will serve as the postmark. Electronic submissions must be received via <http://www.grants.gov>, by June 30, 2011, 11:59 P.M. ET. Proposals postmarked or received after the closing date and time will not be considered for funding.

C. How to Submit Proposals

Applicants have the option to submit their proposals in *one of two ways*: 1) Hard copy by express delivery service or the US postal service, or 2) electronically through to <http://www.grants.gov>. All proposals must be prepared, and include the information as described in Sections IV.D and IV.E below, regardless of mode of transmission.

1. Hard copy submission.

Proposals must be prepared as described in Sections IV.D and IV.E. Because of the unique situation involving U.S. mail screening, **EPA highly recommends that applicants use an express mail option to submit their proposal packages.** If submitting a hardcopy proposal through an express delivery service, the waybill must show that it was submitted for delivery on or before June 30, 2011. Please provide one original of the proposal package (including signed and completed SF 424 and SF 424A forms) and one copy of it (preferably double-sided)--**no binders or spiral binding**--to:

Express Delivery Address (FedEx, UPS, DHL, etc.)

Environmental Protection Agency
1201 Constitution Ave. NW
EPA-East 5213
Attention: Beth Anderson (Mail Code 7409M)
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 564-8833 or (202) 564-8800

If submitting a hardcopy proposal through the US Postal Service, the package must be postmarked by June 30, 2011 and an email alerting EPA to expect the proposal should be sent to: anderson.beth@epa.gov. Please provide one original of the proposal package (including signed and completed SF 424 and SF 424A forms) and one copy of it (preferably double-sided) to:

United States Postal Service Address

Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Pollution Prevention Division
Attention: Beth Anderson (Mail Code 7409M)
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460-0001

2. Electronic submission.

Applicants choosing to submit their proposal electronically must do so through <http://www.grants.gov>. Proposals must be prepared as described in Sections IV.D and IV.E. **Detailed instructions for applying thru the Grants.gov website are provided in Appendix A.**

The electronic submission of your proposal must be made by an Authorized Official Representative (AOR) of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on "Get Registered" on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

After the registration process is complete, your institution may begin the application process to submit a proposal. Proposal materials submitted through Grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically.

To submit a proposal through Grants.gov, please refer to the instructions provided in Appendix A. If you experience technical difficulties while applying electronically, please call 1-800-518-4726 or email support@grants.gov or contact the Agency contact listed in Section VII.

D. Proposal Length and Format

Proposals should be no longer than 20 pages on 8 ½" x 11" paper and single spaced. The response to programmatic capability and past performance must be no more than 10 single-spaced pages. The program implementation plan must be no more than 10 single-spaced pages. Reviewers will only review up to 10 pages each for these two sections. The Budget can be attached as an appendix and does not count towards the page number limit. The Federal forms and appendices such as the budget narrative, references, and indirect cost agreements will not count towards the 20-page limit.

The font used in the proposal should be easily readable. Including page numbers on the proposal facilitates evaluation and discussion. Electronic files must be readable in Adobe Acrobat PDF, MS Word or Word Perfect WP6/7/8 for Windows in English. Full application packages should not be submitted at this time.

E. Proposal Package Content

All proposal submissions, regardless of mode of transmission, must contain a completed and signed SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance, a cover page, a program implementation plan, specific information responding to the evaluation criteria, and a detailed budget narrative. Forms can be found at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/forms/forms.htm>

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)
3. Cover Page

4. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance (no more than 10 single spaced pages)
5. Program Implementation Plan (no more than 10 single spaced pages)
6. Budget Narrative
7. References

1. Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance.

Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711 or visit the website at <http://dnb.com>. Instructions for obtaining a DUNS number may also be found at the following website: <http://www.Grants.Gov/GetStarted>.

2. Standard Form SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs.

Complete the form. There are no attachments. If indirect costs are included, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22. If indirect costs are requested, a copy of the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement must be submitted as part of the proposal package.

3. Cover page: The cover page contains the following information:

- Grant program title;
- Funding opportunity number of the announcement;
- Title of proposal;
- Date submitted;
- Short description of the proposal;
- Total funding amount of the project and requested funding amount of the project;
- Applicant's contact information (i.e., name of applicant, name of organization, mailing address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address); and
- Central Contractor Registration date (**refer to Section VI.C**).
- DUNS Number

Appendix B provides a sample cover page.

4. Programmatic capability and past performance.

This information should respond to the evaluation criteria in Section V.A.1 and must be no more than 10 single-spaced pages. Provide information on your organizational experience and demonstration of ANSI accreditation of the Standard Development Organization through which the standard will be developed. Demonstration of ANSI accreditation may be accomplished by providing the URL to ANSI's website where all ANSI accredited standards development organizations are listed. Provide information on your organizational capacity to successfully manage the proposed project and achieve the objectives of the proposed project including:

- a) Organizational experience and plan for the timely and successful completion of the objectives of the proposed project.** Applicants must provide information on their organization's mission and goals, ANSI accreditation of the Standard Development Organization through which the standard will be developed, current programs, and office

locations and staffing. Applicants must provide information on their operational, financial, and management capabilities to run an effective and efficient voluntary consensus stakeholder-based standards development process via an ANSI accredited SDO. Applicants should document any prior successful work in related technical, environmental, or other standards development processes. Applicants should include information on their organization's financial status, including summary of audited balance sheets for the past three years.

b) Staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project. Applicants should provide information to demonstrate their ability to gather or transfer information regarding the environmental impact of the manufacture, use and disposal of servers and other electronic products to support standards development workgroups. Applicants should describe why staff are well qualified to conduct the proposed project addressing examples listed in Section V.A.1.b.

c) Past Performance: Submit a list of Federally or non-Federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include Federal grants and cooperative agreements but not Federal contracts) similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than 5 agreements, and preferably EPA agreements) and describe whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements.

d) History of reporting. Describe your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements (described above) including whether you adequately and timely reported on your progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes of those agreements (and if not, explain why not) and whether you submitted acceptable final technical reports under the agreements.

In evaluating applicants under these factors in Section V, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current/prior grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

5. Clear and feasible program implementation plan.

The program implementation plan can be no more than 10 single-spaced pages. This work plan must explain the applicant's approach to the three goals listed in Section I.C and provide a clear description of the project strategy. This description should address: tasks and time frame for their accomplishment for each phase; the roles and responsibilities of the recipient in carrying out these tasks, a description of how progress towards the expected outputs/outcomes for each task will be tracked and measured, and how the applicant will work with multiple stakeholders, including

government, manufacturers, environmental community, purchasing community and standards development experts.

The program implementation plan should describe how the applicant will build on the work already completed and the procedure to identify the next 3 to 5 categories of electronic products that should be considered for new standards. The plan should provide any alternative and innovative approaches to developing environmental performance standards for electronic products that the applicant believes would build upon or improve the approach being taken by the EPEAT Standards Development Roadmap

(http://www.zerowaste.org/epeat/roadmap_files/SDR_Final_Roadmap_070824.pdf).

6. Provide a budget narrative.

Provide a detailed budget narrative that describes costs for the total project as well as the cost and personnel effort for each task outlined in the plan. The budget should be outlined in discrete tasks for Phase 1 and Phase 2, for the full \$500,000 of Federal funding over a four year work plan. The detailed budget should estimate the costs for: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other expenses, income, total direct costs, total indirect costs and indicate Federal and non-Federal matching funds in separate columns. Applicants must use the indirect cost rate established by their Federal audit agency or propose a rate and indicate that EPA or another Federal agency will establish a provisional or final rate prior to award. In addition there must be a budget for each discrete task that estimates the cost and full time equivalent (FTE) for personnel.

Management fees. When formulating budgets for proposals, applicants must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs and indirect costs at the rate approved by the applicant's audit agency, or at the rate provided for by the terms of the agreement negotiated with EPA. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under EPA assistance agreements. Management fees or similar charges may not be used to improve or expand the project funded under this agreement, except to the extent authorized as a direct cost of carrying out the scope of work.

Compensation for consultants. The use of EPA financial assistance funds as compensation for consultants is limited to the daily equivalent of the rate paid to Federal employees at the ES-IV level (see 40 CFR Sections 30.27(b) or 31.36(j), as applicable).

Indirect cost rate agreement, if applicable. You must submit a copy of your organization's Indirect Cost Rate Agreement as part of the proposal package if your proposed budget includes indirect costs.

7. References.

Submit a list of at least three references including but not limited to, those from organizations in the electronics industry, institutional purchasing community, standards development community, or electronics recycling. References will be attesting to the applicant's experience and success in

managing and supporting a voluntary consensus standards process concerning the environmental performance of electronic products.

The format described above must be used for all proposals. Within the format guidelines, applicants must include information that relates to the ranking factors outlined in Section V. Where a page limit is specified for a section of this format, reviewers will only read up to the number of pages specified— any material exceeding the page limits will not be considered in the evaluation.

F. Pre-proposal/application assistance and communications

In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1), EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals, provide informal comments on draft proposals, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their proposals. However, consistent with the provisions in the announcement, EPA will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the proposal, and requests for clarification about the announcement. Questions should be directed to the Agency contact identified in Section VII.

EPA will review questions regarding the announcement and will respond to those that may be pertinent to all potential applicants and modify the announcement if necessary. **The questions must be submitted in writing by May 16, 2011, 11:59 P.M. ET to Beth Anderson at Anderson.beth@epa.gov.** EPA's responses will be posted on <http://www.epa.gov/p2/pubs/grants/index.htm> and on <http://www.grants.gov/>.

G. Amending This Solicitation

EPA reserves the right to amend this solicitation as necessary. Amendments could be administrative (such as changes in dates), technical (such as a change in requirements), or fiscal. If this need occurs, EPA will post the amended solicitation at the same location as this announcement and the amendment will also be posted on <http://www.grants.gov> and <http://www.epa.gov/p2/pubs/grants/index.htm>.

H. Other Submission Requirements

1. Intergovernmental review.

This program is eligible for coverage under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs" and 40 CFR Part 29. An applicant should consult the office or official designated as the single point of contact in his or her State for more information on the process the State requires to be followed in applying for assistance, if the State has selected the program for review. If the State has not selected the program for review or the State does not have a single point of contact, applicants must coordinate directly with affected State, area-wide, regional, and local entities. If the applicant does not know who their single point of contact is, they are advised to call the EPA Headquarters Grant Policy Information and Training Branch at 202-564-5325 or refer to the State Single Point of Contact website at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/.

Federally-recognized Tribal governments are not required to comply with this procedure.

2. Confidential business information.

In accordance with 40 CFR 2.203, applicants may claim all or a portion of their proposal as confidential business information. EPA will evaluate confidentiality claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. Applicants must clearly mark proposals or portions of the proposal they claim as confidential. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204(c) (2) prior to disclosure. If no claim of confidentiality is made, EPA is not required to make the inquiry to the applicant otherwise required by 40 CFR 2.204 (c) (2) prior to disclosure. However, competitive proposals are considered confidential and protected from disclosure prior to the completion of the competitive selection process.

3. Using funds for subawards, contract services or partnerships.

EPA awards funds to one eligible applicant as the recipient even if other eligible applicants are named as partners or co-applicants or members of a coalition or consortium. The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds.

Funding may be used to provide subgrants or subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards or subgrants to fund partnerships, provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards or subgrants including those contained in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses, to the extent required by the procurement provisions of the regulations at 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31, as appropriate. The regulations also contain limitations on consultant compensation. Applicants are not required to identify subawardees/subgrantees and/or contractors (including consultants) in their proposal. However, if they do, the fact that an applicant selected for award has named a specific subawardee/subgrantee, contractor, or consultant in the proposal EPA selects for funding does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward/subgrant and/or competitive procurement requirements as appropriate. Please note that applicants may not award sole source contracts to consulting, engineering or other firms assisting applicants with the proposal solely based on the firm's role in preparing the proposal.

Successful applicants cannot use subgrants or subawards to avoid requirements in EPA grant regulations for competitive procurement by using these instruments to acquire commercial services or products from for-profit organizations to carry out its assistance agreement. The nature of the transaction between the recipient and the subawardee or subgrantee must be consistent with the standards for distinguishing between vendor transactions and subrecipient assistance under Subpart B Section .210 of OMB Circular A-133 , and the definitions of subaward at 40 CFR 30.2(ff) or subgrant at 40 CFR 31.3, as applicable. EPA will not be a party to these transactions. Applicants acquiring commercial goods or services must comply with the competitive procurement standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR Part 31.36 and cannot use a subaward/subgrant as the funding mechanism.

4. Consideration of proposed subawardees/subgrantees and contractors during the evaluation process described in Section V of the announcement.

Section V of the announcement describes the evaluation criteria and evaluation process that will be used by EPA to make selections under this announcement. During this evaluation, except for those criteria that relate to the applicant's own qualifications, past performance, and reporting history, the review panel will consider, if appropriate and relevant, the qualifications, expertise, and experience of:

a) An applicant's named subawardees/subgrantees identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in the proposal that if it receives an award that the subaward/subgrant will be properly awarded consistent with the applicable regulations in 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. For example, applicants must not use subawards/subgrants to obtain commercial services or products from for-profit firms or individual consultants.

b) An applicant's named contractor(s), including consultants, identified in the proposal if the applicant demonstrates in its proposal that the contractor(s) was selected in compliance with the competitive Procurement Standards in 40 CFR Part 30 or 40 CFR 31.36 as appropriate. For example, an applicant must demonstrate that it selected the contractor(s) competitively or that a proper non-competitive sole-source award consistent with the regulations will be made to the contractor(s), that efforts were made to provide small and disadvantaged businesses with opportunities to compete, and that some form of cost or price analysis was conducted. EPA may not accept sole source justifications for contracts for services or products that are otherwise readily available in the commercial marketplace.

EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subawardees/subgrantees and/or named contractor(s) during the proposal/proposal evaluation process unless the applicant complies with these requirements.

V. PROPOSAL REVIEW INFORMATION

A. Evaluation Criteria

Only the proposals meeting the threshold eligibility criteria in [Section III](#) will be evaluated against the criteria presented in this section. Applicants should directly and explicitly address these criteria as part of their proposal submittal. Proposals can receive a maximum score of 106.

1. Programmatic capability and past performance criteria. (41 points) Proposals will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project (see Section IV.E.4) taking into account the applicant's:

a) Organizational experience and plan for the timely and successfully achieving the objectives of the proposed project (Section IV.E.4.a). (15 points)

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they document and demonstrate their operational, financial, and management capabilities to run an effective and efficient stakeholder-based voluntary standard development process via an ANSI accredited SDO. In

addition, applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they document prior successful work in related technical, environmental and other standard development processes.

b) Staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project (Section IV.E.4.b). (16 points)

- Applicants must demonstrate that the project participants are well qualified to conduct the proposed project and have a demonstrated record of success in their previous work in areas related to technical, environmental and other standards development. Applicants must describe staff experience in the following areas: facilitating complex multi-stakeholders processes while maintaining credibility and independence from key stakeholder groups; familiarity with Robert's Rules of Order or similar rules for managing formal meetings; and experience with tools that facilitate large face-to-face and virtual group discussions and development of consensus, such as use of Survey Monkey® and Webex technology (8 points).
- Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they demonstrate their ability to gather and transfer information regarding the environmental impact of the manufacture, use and disposal of two categories of electronic products, provide technical and research support for electronic product workgroups, and develop standards based on the information collected (8 points).

c) Past performance (5 points)

Past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements described in Section IV.E.4.c of the announcement.

d) History of meeting reporting requirements (5 points)

History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements described in Section IV.E.4.d of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not.

Note: In evaluating applicants under this criterion, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance or past reporting information, please indicate this in the proposal and you will receive a neutral score of 2.5 points for these sub-factors (items iii and iv above). If you do not provide any response for these items, you may receive a score of 0 for these factors.

2. Clear and feasible program implementation plan (50 points):

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent they provide a clear description of their strategy to achieve the program goals (Section IV.E.4) focusing on the following factors:

a) Project strategy (30 points): The proposal provides a clear and well-crafted description of the approach to research and provide training and technical assistance to create technical, environmental and other criteria for two categories of electronic devices.

b) Work with multiple stakeholders (10 points): The proposal demonstrates a well-crafted approach for gaining input and participation from multiple stakeholders in a variety of groups such as: manufacturers, suppliers to manufacturers, trade associations, environmental advocacy groups, purchasers, academic experts, resellers, reuse and recycle organizations, general public, etc.

c) Timeline for tracking progress (10 points) and distinct tasks during the standards development process.

3. Detailed budget and narrative (15 points):

Under this criterion (Section IV.E.5), the Agency will evaluate:

a) The extent to which the detailed budget presents estimated costs (5 points) for each budget object class (personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other expenses, income, total direct costs, total indirect costs) and indicates Federal and non-Federal matching funds in separate columns;

b) The extent to which the detailed budget indicates the cost of each major task (10 points) of the proposed plan and the costs are reasonable and necessary to accomplish the proposed task.

B. Evaluation of oral presentation

The following criteria, worth a total of 30 points (10 points each), will be used to evaluate up to three of the top ranked applicants, based on their numerical score under the criteria in Section V.A. These applicants will be asked to make an oral presentation that addresses and clearly demonstrates the applicant's:

- Ability to manage a complex project similar in scope and size,
- Ability to convene and involve diverse stakeholders in a voluntary consensus standards process, and
- Plan for managing multiple workgroups and tracking progress toward milestones.

C. Review and Selection Process

Proposals will first be evaluated against the threshold factors listed in Section III. Only those proposals, which meet all of the threshold factors, will be evaluated. The review panel composed of EPA staff and external (non-EPA) reviewers will evaluate the proposals using the criteria

described in Section V.A. EPA staff reviewing the proposals will include members from the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, another EPA headquarters office and at least two regional offices. The external reviewers may include representatives from the electronics, purchasing, and environmental fields. All of the reviewers will be required to certify that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to any proposal or applicant. Each proposal will be given a numerical score and will be rank-ordered according to the numerical score.

Based on the initial evaluation results, up to three of the top ranked applicants will be asked to make a presentation that addresses the three criteria listed in Section V.B. The presentation will be delivered in a videoconference or a teleconference meeting with EPA and external reviewers. This presentation will be to provide reviewers with more depth and detail on the applicant's ability to: manage a complex project similar in scope and size, convene and involve diverse stakeholders in a voluntary consensus standards process, and plan and manage multiple workgroups while tracking progress towards specific milestones.

After the presentations, the review panel will combine the scores from the evaluation of the presentations with the scores from the initial evaluation of the proposals to make a funding recommendation to the Assistant Administrator of EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention who is the Approving Official.

VI. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Award Notices

Following EPA's evaluation of proposals, all applicants will be notified regarding their status. High-ranking applicants (based on the initial proposal review described in V.B.1) will be notified that they have been selected to make an oral presentation.

Additional documents to complete the application will be requested from the eligible entity whose proposal was highly ranked and successfully evaluated in the oral presentation. The entity will be provided with instructions and a due date for submittal of their final application package.

1. EPA anticipates notification to the *successful* applicant will be made, via telephone, electronic or postal mail within 180 days from the date proposals are due. The notification will advise the applicant that its proposal has been successfully evaluated and recommended for award. The notification will be sent to the original signer of the Standard Form (SF) 424, Proposal for Federal Assistance.

This notification, which advises that the applicant's proposal has been recommended for award, is not an authorization to begin performance. The award notice signed by the EPA grants officer is the authorizing document and will be provided through postal mail. At a minimum, this process can take at least 90 days from the date of recommendation.

2. EPA anticipates notification to *unsuccessful* applicant(s) will be made via electronic or postal mail within 15 days from the final selection. The notification will be sent to the original signer of the SF 424, Proposal for Federal Assistance.

B. Subaward and Executive Compensation Reporting

Applicants must ensure that they have the necessary processes and systems in place to comply with the sub-award and executive total compensation reporting requirements established under OMB guidance at [2 CFR Part 170](#), unless they qualify for an exception from the requirements, should they be selected for funding.

C. Central Contractor Registration (CCR) and Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Requirements

Unless exempt from these requirements under OMB guidance at [2 CFR Part 25](#) (e.g., individuals), applicants must:

1. Be registered in the CCR prior to submitting an application or proposal under this announcement. CCR information can be found at <https://www.bpn.gov/ccr/>
2. Maintain an active CCR registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application or proposal under consideration by an agency, and
3. Provide its DUNS number in each application or proposal it submits to the agency. Applicants can receive a DUNS number, at no cost, by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1-866-705-5711, or visiting the D&B website at: <http://www.dnb.com>.

If an applicant fails to comply with these requirements, it will, should it be selected for award, affect their ability to receive the award.

D. Unliquidated Obligations

An applicant that receives an award under this announcement is expected to manage assistance agreement funds efficiently and effectively and make sufficient progress towards completing the project activities described in the work-plan in a timely manner. The assistance agreement will include terms/conditions implementing this requirement.

E. Dispute Resolution Process

Assistance agreement competition-related disputes will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures published in 70 FR (Federal Register) 3629, 3630 (January 26, 2005) that can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/competition/resolution.htm>. Copies of these procedures may also be requested by contacting: anderson.beth@epa.gov.

F. Non-profit organizations

Non-profit applicants that are recommended for funding under this announcement are subject to pre-award administrative capability reviews consistent with Section 8b, 8c and 9d of EPA Order 5700.8 - Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/grants/award/5700_8.pdf). In addition, non-profit applicants that qualify for funding may, depending on the size of the award, be required to fill out and submit to the Grants Management Office the Administrative Capabilities Form with supporting documents contained in Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.8.

G. Data access and information release

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-110 has been revised to provide public access to research data through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) under some circumstances. Data that are (1) first produced in a project that is supported in whole or in part with Federal funds and (2) cited publicly and officially by a Federal agency in support of an action that has the force and effect of law (i.e., a regulation) may be accessed through FOIA. If such data are requested by the public, the EPA must ask for it, and the grantee must submit it, in accordance with A-110 and EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. 30.36.

H. Administrative Requirements

1. EPA regulations.

A listing and description of general EPA regulations applicable to the award of assistance agreements may be viewed at:

http://www.epa.gov/ogd/AppKit/applicable_epa_regulations_and_description.htm.

2. Reimbursement limitation.

If the recipient expends more than the amount of funding in its EPA approved budget in anticipation of receiving additional funds from EPA, it does so at its own risk. EPA is not legally obligated to reimburse the recipient for costs incurred in excess of the EPA approved budget.

3. Audits.

Periodic audits should be made as part of the recipient's system of financial management and internal control to meet the terms and conditions of grants and other assistance agreements. In accordance with the provisions of OMB Circular No. A-133, State agencies that receive less than \$500,000 within the State's fiscal year shall have an audit made in accordance with Federal laws and regulations governing the programs in which they participate.

4. Records.

Financial records, including all documents to support entries on accounting records to substantiate charges to each assistance agreement, must be kept available to personnel authorized to examine EPA assistance agreement accounts. All records must be maintained for three years from the date of submission of the annual financial status report. If questions still remain, such as those posed as a result of an audit, related records should be retained until the matter is completely resolved.

5. Reporting.

Funding recipients must complete semi-annual and annual reports, as well as provide a final report at the end of the grant period. Reports must address the status of all activities in the proposal (including measures) and a statement of impacts and expenses. The final report shall be completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of the period of performance. The final report should encompass a complete overview/summary of all of the activities conducted within the grant project period. Specific financial, technical and other reporting requirements to measure the grant recipient's progress will be identified in the EPA grant award agreement.

The work plans and reporting must be consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 30, subpart C or of 40 CFR 31, subpart C. A description of the evaluation process and a reporting schedule must be included in the work plan. Recipients should provide discussion of accomplishments as measured against work plan commitments; a discussion of cumulative effectiveness of the work performed under all work plan components; a discussion of existing and potential problem areas; and suggestions for improvement, including where feasible, schedules for making improvements, as described in 40 CFR 35.

VII. AGENCY CONTACT

For more information about this announcement, please contact:

Beth Anderson

EPA's Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics

Pollution Prevention Division

anderson.beth @epa.gov

202-564-8833

VIII. OTHER INFORMATION

For current information on the Electronic Product Environmental Assessment tool (EPEAT) refer to this EPA web page: <http://www.epa.gov/epp/pubs/products/epeat/index.htm>

For more general information about environmentally preferable purchasing of electronic products refer to this EPA web page: <http://www.epa.gov/epp/pubs/products/electronic.htm>

Exchange network.

Applicants should be aware that EPA, States, Tribes and territories are working together to develop the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, a secure, Internet and standards-based way to support electronic data reporting, sharing, and integration of both regulatory and non-regulatory environmental data. States, Tribes and territories that exchange data with each other or with EPA, should make the Exchange Network and the Agency's connection to it, the Central Data Exchange (CDX), the standard way they exchange data and should phase out any legacy methods they used previously. More information on the Exchange Network is available at <http://www.exchangenetwork.net>.

Appendix A

Instructions for Applying through Grants.gov

The electronic submission of your proposal must be made by an Authorized Official Representative (AOR) of your institution who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal assistance. For more information, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on “Get Registered” on the left side of the page. *Note that the registration process may take a week or longer to complete.* If your organization is not currently registered with Grants.gov, please encourage your office to designate an AOR and ask that individual to begin the registration process as soon as possible.

To begin the proposal process under this grant announcement, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Apply for Grants” tab on the left side of the page. Then click on “Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package” to download the compatible Adobe viewer and obtain the application package. **To apply through Grants.gov you must use Adobe Reader applications and download the compatible Adobe Reader version (Adobe Reader applications are available to [download for free on the Grants.gov website](#).** For more information on Adobe Reader please visit the [Help section](#) on grants.gov at <http://www.grants.gov/help/help.jsp> or http://www.grants.gov/aboutgrants/program_status.jsp.

Once you have downloaded the viewer, you may retrieve the application package by entering the **Funding Opportunity Number: EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-01 and the CFDA number that applies to the announcement, CFDA 66.717**, in the appropriate field. You may also be able to access the proposal package by clicking on the Application button at the top right of the synopsis page for this announcement on <http://www.grants.gov> (to find the synopsis page, go to <http://www.grants.gov> and click on the “Find Grant Opportunities” button on the left side of the page and then go to Search Opportunities and use the Browse by Agency feature to find EPA opportunities).

A. Proposal Submission Deadline

Your organization’s AOR must submit your complete proposal electronically to EPA through Grants.gov (<http://www.grants.gov>) **no later than June 30, 2011, 11:59 P.M. ET**. Please submit all of the proposal materials described below.

B. Proposal Materials

The following forms and documents are required to be submitted under this announcement as **specified in Section IV.E** and are listed below:

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)
3. Cover Page
4. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance
(no more than 10 single spaced pages)
5. Program Implementation Plan (no more than 10 single spaced pages)

6. Budget Narrative
7. References

1. Standard form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance.

Complete the form. There are no attachments. Please be sure to include organization fax number and email address in Block 5 of the Standard Form SF 424.

Please note that the organizational Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Number System (DUNS) number must be included on the SF-424. Organizations may obtain a DUNS number at no cost by calling the toll-free DUNS number request line at 1-866-705-5711.

2. Standard Form SF-424A, Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs.

Complete the form. There are no attachments. If indirect costs are included, the amount of indirect costs should be entered on line 6(j). The indirect cost rate (i.e., a percentage), the base (e.g., personnel costs and fringe benefits), and the amount should also be indicated on line 22. If indirect costs are requested, a copy of the Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement must be submitted as part of the proposal package.

3. Cover page.

See section IV.E and Appendix B.

4. Programmatic capability and past performance.

This information should respond to the evaluation criteria in Section V.A.1 a. and must be no more than 10 single spaced pages. Provide information on your organizational experience and capacity to successfully manage the proposed project and achieve the objectives of the proposed project including: a) organizational experience and plan for the timely and successful completion of the objectives of the proposed project; b) staff expertise/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project; c) past performance; and d) history of reporting. For more detail on what information to include in this submission review section IV.E.

5. Clear and feasible program implementation.

The program implementation plan can be no more than 10 single-spaced pages. This work plan must explain the applicant's approach to the three goals listed in Section I.C and provide a clear description of the project strategy. For more detail on what information to include in this submission review section IV.E.

6. Provide a budget narrative.

Provide a detailed budget narrative that describes costs for the total project as well as estimated costs for: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other expenses, income, total direct costs, total indirect costs and non-Federal matching funds.

7. References.

Submit a list of at least three references including but not limited to, those from organizations in the electronics industry, institutional purchasing community, standards development community, or

electronics recycling. References will be attesting to the applicant's experience and success in managing and supporting a voluntary consensus standards process concerning the environmental performance of electronic products.

C. Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions.

Documents in Section B (just above this section) listed under **Proposal Materials** above should appear in the "Mandatory Documents" box on the Grants.gov Grant Application Package page. For documents **1 and 2**, click on the appropriate form and then click "Open Form" below the box. The fields that must be completed will be highlighted in yellow. Optional fields and completed fields will be displayed in white. If you enter an invalid response or incomplete information in a field, you will receive an error message. When you have finished filling out each form, click "Save." When you return to the electronic Grant Application Package page, click on the form you just completed, and then click on the box that says, "Move Form to Submission List." This action will move the document over to the box that says, "Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission."

For documents **3, 4, 5, 6 and 7**, you will need to attach electronic files. Prepare your document as described above in Section IV.E and save the document to your computer as an MS Word, PDF or WordPerfect file. When you are ready to attach your document to the application package, click on "Project Narrative Attachment Form," and open the form. Click "Add Mandatory Project Narrative File," and then attach your document (previously saved to your computer) using the browser window that appears. You may then click "View Mandatory Project Narrative File" to view it. Enter a brief descriptive title of your document in the space beside "Mandatory Project Narrative File Filename;" the filename should be no more than 40 characters long.

For other attachments that you would like to submit, you need to click "Add Optional Project Narrative File" and proceed as before. When you have finished attaching the necessary documents, click "Close Form." When you return to the "Grant Application Package" page, select the "Project Narrative Attachment Form" and click "Move Form to Submission List." The form should now appear in the box that says, "Mandatory Completed Documents for Submission."

D. Saving Your Work.

Once you have finished filling out all of the forms/attachments and they appear in one of the "Completed Documents for Submission" boxes, click the "Save" button that appears at the top of the Web page. It is suggested that you save the document a second time, using a different name, since this will make it easier to submit an amended package later if necessary. Please use the following format when saving your file: "Applicant Name – FY11 – Assoc Prog Supp – 1st Submission" or "Applicant Name – FY 11 Assoc Prog Supp – Back-up Submission." If it becomes necessary to submit an amended package at a later date, then the name of the 2nd submission should be changed to "Applicant Name – FY11 Assoc Prog Supp – 2nd Submission."

Once your proposal package has been completed and saved, send it to your AOR for submission to EPA through Grants.gov. Please advise your AOR to close all other software programs before attempting to submit the proposal package through Grants.gov.

In the “Application Filing Name” box, your AOR should enter your organization’s name (abbreviate where possible), the fiscal year (e.g., FY11), and the grant category (e.g., Assoc Prog Supp). The filing name should not exceed 40 characters. From the “Grant Application Package” page, your AOR may submit the application package by clicking the “Submit” button that appears at the top of the page. The AOR will then be asked to verify the agency and funding opportunity number for which the application package is being submitted. If problems are encountered during the submission process, the AOR should reboot his/her computer before trying to submit the application package again. [It may be necessary to turn off the computer (not just restart it) before attempting to submit the package again.] If the AOR continues to experience submission problems, he/she may contact Grants.gov for assistance by phone at 1-800-518-4726 or email support@grants.gov or contact the person listed in Section VII of this announcement.

Proposal packages submitted through Grants.gov will be time/date stamped electronically.

If you have not received a confirmation of receipt from EPA (*not from Grants.gov*) within 30 days of the application deadline, please contact the person listed in Section VII. Failure to do so may result in your application not being reviewed.

Appendix B

Sample Cover Page

[Grant Program Title] **Request for Proposals to Develop Standards for Environmentally Preferable Electronic Products**

[Funding Opportunity Number] **EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-01**

[Proposal Title] **Pollution Prevention Program**

[Date submitted] **July 4, 2011**

[Short Project Description – fewer than 300 characters]

The proposed project will provide up-to-date pollution prevention (P2) information through peer-reviewed website information. Webinars will provide outreach and information on current P2 topics. An annual conference will provide networking opportunities for States, local governments and technical assistance providers in the region.

[Project funding and Project Period]

Total Project Funding: \$500,000

Requested Funding: \$475,000

Project Start date: October 1, 2011

Project End Date: September 30, 2015

[Applicant's contact information. The contact information should include a primary contact, i.e., the person responsible for implementing the grant project and if desired an administrative contact, i.e., the person responsible for submitting the grant proposal]

Jane Doe
Grants Office
State EPA
111 Clean Air Drive
Anytown, State Zip code
Tel: 222-222-2222
Fax: 222-222-2222
Email: mary.doe@stateepa

John Doe
Pollution Prevention Program
State EPA
111 Clean Air Drive
Anytown, State Zip Code
Tel: 222-222-2222
Fax: 222-222-2222
Email: john.doe@stateepa

[Central Contractor Registration]

Central Contractor Registration Date: 1/08/2011

DUNS Number