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1. Overview

This appendix supports the objectives and oversight structure put in place by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) in its 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Monitoring Plan and in its 2010 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Monitoring Manual for the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP), State Energy Program (SEP), and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants programs (EECBG), all managed by the EERE Office of Weatherization and Intergovernmental (OWIP). The general roles and responsibilities of the Project Officer, OWIP Liaisons, and other staff are outlined in the 2010 ARRA Monitoring Manual.

As part of the original 2009 ARRA Monitoring Plan’s structure, an initial set of checklists was developed and used by Project Officers to gauge the compliance of Grantees in adhering to the statutes and regulations pertinent to the WAP, SEP and EECBG programs. These compliance checklists were restructured as part of this appendix on March 3, 2010. This restructuring allows for a separate approval process to be instituted for the checklists to address the higher expected frequency of updates to these compliance tools as the monitoring program matures and incorporates knowledge and experience from the field. The purpose of this appendix is to outline the change control process needed to amend the compliance checklists that are submitted to DOE Headquarters from Project Officers in the field.

This appendix also contains the most current compliance checklists in the DOE electronic grants management tool. The Compliance checklists include the WAP Desktop checklist, WAP Onsite checklist, SEP Desktop Checklist, SEP Onsite checklist, EECBG Desktop checklist and the EECBG Onsite Checklist. Using these checklists, Projects Officers will:

1) Conduct desktop and Onsite monitoring of WAP, SEP, or EECBG programs,
2) Submit the appropriate checklist through the proper DOE electronic grants management tool within the timeline specified by OWIP,
3) Work with OWIP and other resources to resolve issues identified from grants monitoring.

The authority of the change control process is established under the 2009 Monitoring Plan, as revised on March 3, 2010. Future changes to the 2009 Monitoring Plan will follow existing signatory concurrence process while changes to this document will require the signature of the Executive Director of Field Operations and the Program Manager of OWIP.

1.1. Change Control Process for Modifying Compliance Checklist

Periodically, Compliance Checklists will require updates as Grantee monitoring matures. Changes will typically fall into two categories—non-substantive and substantive changes. Since these two types of changes have different impacts on the monitoring program, the time and attention given to each should be properly reflected in the change control process. The proper
change control process must be followed in order to amend the compliance checklists. Currently, Project Officers access the checklists by using the Grants Reporting and Analysis Software System (GRASS). The team of individuals supporting this system, referred to as the GRASS team, coordinates the change control process for the checklists.

1.1.1. “Non-Substantive” Change Control Process

Small, less impactful changes referred to as “non-substantive changes to the Compliance Checklists include modifications to the grammar, spelling, and the punctuation of the questions. Non-substantive changes also include modifying the wording of the question to clarify a question’s meaning or adding pre-approved guidance to questions in GRASS. The non-substantive configuration control process is meant to address what is considered to be minor changes in a documented but expedient way. The change control process is as follows:

1) Incorporating feedback from the Field Offices and other DOE staff members, the GRASS team documents the small modifications necessary for the compliance checklists. The GRASS team will also make recommendations on the resolution of the problems.
2) The GRASS team will submit both the small changes and solutions to the WAP, SEP or EE CBG Program lead (or appropriate designee) in OWIP. The GRASS team will also consult with Field Operations on these changes.
3) The appropriate Program Lead (or program designee) provides the necessary feedback and approval for these small changes. Field Operations is notified of the solution.
4) Working with the GRASS web developers, the GRASS Team will coordinate and implement the changes.
5) The GRASS team will notify Project Officers of the change, as needed.
1.1.2. “Substantive” Change Control Process

Impactful changes to the Compliance Checklists referred to as “Substantive” changes will require a more involved and formal concurrence process as well as acceptance from the Executive Director of Field Operations and the Program Manager of OWIP. Substantive changes are defined as significant changes to questions where the intent and spirit of the question is altered. These substantive changes include re-ordering of the questions in the compliance checklist, altering the yes/no/NA/yes with a follow-up structure to the answers, addition of new questions, deletion of existing questions, and the merging of multiple questions. The change control process is as follows:

1) Incorporating feedback from the Field Offices, Program Leads, Field Liaison and other DOE staff members, the GRASS team documents the large changes necessary for the compliance checklists. The GRASS team will also make recommendations on the resolution of the problems.

2) When necessary, the GRASS team will coordinate a concurrence meeting between representatives from Field Operations and the WAP, SEP or EECBG Program Lead (or appropriate designee) from OWIP. The Chief Financial Officer’s office will be made aware of the pending changes to the compliance checklists. Representatives from the CFO’s office may also submit their feedback for review during the concurrence meeting.

3) The concurrence meeting is held where all the feedback is reviewed. The GRASS team will facilitate the concurrence meeting, documenting meeting notes and compiling the final changes to the compliance checklist. All the participants of the concurrence meeting must approve the final resolution for changes to the compliance checklist.

4) Written approval of the final concurrence resolution must be obtained from the Executive Director of Field Operations and the Program Manager of OWIP. The GRASS team will document the written approvals. The DOE Chief Financial Officer’s office, the EERE Chief Operating Officer and the EERE Deputy Assistant Secretary will be made aware of the final changes.

5) Working with the GRASS web developers, the GRASS Team will coordinate and implement the final changes. OWIP will be kept apprised of the progress and expected implementation of the changes.
6) When the final changes are implemented, Project Officers will be notified of the changes. Written guidance of the changes will be provided to the Project Officers so that they are trained. The GRASS team will follow-up with any necessary training to ensure that Project Officers are fully instructed.

1.2. Feedback Procedures and Timelines

As outlined in the procedures above, the GRASS team coordinates all checklist changes. Change Requests often come through the OWIP program liaisons, but may also be originated by PO’s in the field or others. The GRASS team may be contacted directly through email: AskGRASS@ee.doe.gov. All requests will be logged and addressed. A non-substantive change may be turned around within one week, depending on the change required. However, some non-substantive changes may be documented and held until additional changes are needed. Typically, a lead time of a month is required for substantive changes. This allows the GRASS team to ensure appropriate documentation and concurrence of all changes, in addition to allowing time for software development and testing within GRASS itself.
2. **WAP Desktop Checklist Questions**

*The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s ability to follow the basic administrative requirements of WAP, and whether they have submitted their required forms and reports on time.*

* 1. Has Grantee submitted all required reports to DOE on time?
  * a. Management Progress Report (quarterly)
  * b. ARRA Performance Progress Report (quarterly)
  * c. Weatherization Assistance Program Report (DOE 540.3) (quarterly)
  * d. Annual T&TA, monitoring, and leveraging report (DOE 540.4) (annually)
  * f. Award Level Transaction Data (per obligations)
  * g. Annual Indirect Cost Proposal (annually)
  * h. Property Certification (once, after award completion)
  * i. Davis Bacon

*The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s Management Progress Report. The Grantee is required to submit regularly scheduled progress reports to DOE that provide a concise narrative assessment of the status of work being done. The Monitor should compare items and activities in progress report with those in the Grantee’s State Plan to ascertain whether Grantee is meeting its goals, how well the Grantee is following its plan, and whether Grantee is on track to fulfill the requirements of the grant.*

* 2. Does the DOE award number, name of the recipient, project title and name of the project director on the Progress Report match those on the Grantee’s approved State Plan?

* 3. Does the Grantee list their actual accomplishments, including major activities, significant results, major findings or conclusions, key outcomes or other achievements?

4. The Grantee is required to provide a Schedule Status that lists milestones, anticipated completion dates and actual completion dates. Do they?

5. Has the Grantee compared its actual accomplishments with the goals, milestones and objectives for the reporting period?

* 6. If actual accomplishments fell short of the goals, milestones and objectives, did the Grantee explain why the established goals were not met and how the goals and objectives will be met in the future?

7. When comparing actual to anticipated completion dates, is the Grantee completing (or are they on track to complete) their milestones on time? Note: If the Grantee submitted a project management plan with their application, they must use this plan to report schedule and budget variances.
* 8. If there are any changes in approach or aims, did the Grantee provide reasons for the changes listed? Note: Any significant changes to the objectives and scope require prior approval by the Contracting Officer.

* 9. Based on work completed to date, is the Grantee on track to be within budget, on schedule, and meet their overall goals as stated in their plan, by program completion? If not did the Grantee provide an explanation?

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s plan for satisfying Recovery Act performance metrics, which is part of the law. Grantees are required to report their Recovery Act metrics.

* 10. Have the Grantees and sub-grantees registered on www.federalreporting.gov in order to submit Recovery Act reporting requirements to OMB?

* - Denotes Critical Question
3. **WAP On-site Checklist Questions**

*The following question pertains to the results of the Desktop review of the Grantee.*

1. Please describe any issues that have been identified in the desktop monitoring that should be addressed during the on-site visit.

*The following questions pertain to Davis Bacon requirements.*

2. Is Grantee aware of which labor and wage requirements apply to their activities?

*3. Is Grantee complying with labor and wage requirements (i.e. fair labor laws, Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws, etc.)*

4. Have sub-grantees submitted weekly payrolls?

*5. Are payroll records on site in the State office?*

*The following questions pertain to Buy American Act requirements.*

*6. Is the Grantee ensuring that their purchasing procedures and the sub-grantee’s purchasing Procedures are compliant with “Buy American?”*

7. Are records kept on site in the State office demonstrating this compliance?

*The following questions pertain to Grantees’ financial management system to ascertain whether they have an adequate system in place.*

*8. What system does the Grantee use for comparing expenditures to budgeted amounts?*

9. Is the Grantee’s financial management system capable of tracking and reporting Recovery Act funds separately from leveraged/other funds?

*10. Can the Grantee/sub-grantee track a single expenditure through the accounting system by:
   *a. Fund code
   *b. Sample type of transaction
   *c. Amount
   *d. Fund source.*

*11. Does the Grantee use periodic financial reports as a management control tool?*

12. How frequently are audits completed?
   a. Who conducts the audits?
b. When was the most recent audit completed?

13. Is the WAP Grant specifically reviewed in the audit?

*14. Is there a system in place that tracks Grantee audit findings, recommendations, and corrective actions?

15. Have all outstanding audit findings that may apply to or impact WAP been resolved? If no, please explain.

*16. Have other State, Federal or private resources been leveraged to enhance utilization of WAP funding and if so, are leveraged funds being properly accounted for and reported? If no, please explain.

*17. Please summarize below any findings specific to WAP found in the most recent audit report.

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s written financial operations manual, which outlines how they handle their financial management.

18. Does the Grantee have a written financial operations manual?

*19. Does the Grantee’s written financial operations manual contain adequate information addressing:
   *a. Segregation of duties
   *b. Accounting standards and practices
   *c. Payment procedures
   *d. Approval authority
   *e. Record keeping requirements.

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of sub-grantees. Under the Weatherization Assistance Program, Grantees are supposed to monitor their sub-grantees.

20. Does the Grantee have a guide for monitoring the sub-grantee performance? (Monitors will review the guide and describe any deficiencies if they exist.)

*21. Does the monitoring guide cover all areas found in the sub-grantee’s contract and the Grantee’s plan, and all applicable Federal regulations and program guidance documents?

22. Are the current contracts and any amendments between the Grantee and sub-grantees signed and properly executed by both parties?

23. How often is Grantee conducting monitoring of sub-grantees?

*24. Have all issues, perceived issues and potential issues, as determined by the Grantee, been raised with the sub-grantee?
25. Has sub-grantee provided required reports on its client education activities?

*26. Are sanctions imposed for sub-grantees that fail to comply with program requirements?

27. Are there procedures in place for the Grantee to ensure that sub-grantees maintain adequate documentation and monitoring of personnel issues such as timesheets, time allocations, and leave, etc?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s personnel.

*28. Are Grantee personnel paid from a single source of funds? If not, explain.

29. Is staff time being properly recorded against the grant they are working on?
30. Has DOE been notified of any personnel being charged to more than one grant?

31. Are all Grantee personnel to be paid with grant funds accounted for on the Grantee’s organizational chart?

32. Has the organizational structure remained unchanged since the grant was awarded?
   a. If it has changed, has this been amended in the State Plan or reported to the Project Officer?

33. Are personnel policies on job classifications, time and attendance, leave and overtime established in writing and distributed to employees?

*34. Is there an established process for determining whether costs incurred by staff are allowable?

*35. Do the work hours estimated in the Grantee Plan appear to match the actual hours spent working on the Program? If there is a discrepancy, please explain.

36. Are key personnel actually performing the duties originally proposed, if applicable (e.g. key personnel identified in the grant application)?

*37. Does the Grantee believe it has sufficient staffing to meet requirements and goals?
   a. If not, has this been discussed with the management in charge of overseeing hiring decisions?
   b. Describe below how is it being resolved?
      The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of all vehicles and equipment.

38. Does the Grantee have a master inventory list of vehicles and equipment?
39. Are there written procedures covering the inventory, maintenance, and disposition of vehicles/equipment?

*40. Is there a process in place to ensure that purchases/leases-to-purchase meet all financial and program requirements, including DOE prior approval, where applicable?

41. This question applies only if vehicles or equipment have been purchased in excess of $5,000: Was DOE approval obtained for the vehicle or equipment purchase in excess of $5,000? If no, please provide the following information:

* 42. Are there safeguards in place to ensure that vehicle/equipment costs are charged to the appropriate program (and category)?

43. Are all vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds used for only this Program (i.e. fulltime use)?

*44. If vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds are going to be used for non-program purposes (i.e. part time use), it should be clearly documented what the other programs are and what portion of the cost is from weatherization funds. Is this the case?

45. Are the vehicles/equipment/tools currently being used appropriate and adequate for the job and to ensure cost-effective delivery of services?

* 46. Has a physical inventory of equipment been taken and the results reconciled with the property records within the last two years? 

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s procurement process.

47. Does the procurement process clearly separate duties as they pertain to WAP procurement activities?

48. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee following the State’s procurement standards?

49. Is there a clear process for determining the use and selection of sub-grantees?

50. Does the Grantee review procurement of sub-contractors to ensure full and open competition?

51. Does the procurement process specifically address equipment purchase procedures?

52. Are efforts made to ensure fairness in bidding and contracting procedures with small businesses, women’s business enterprises, and minority-owned firms, pursuant to Federal law?
53. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to avoid unnecessary or duplicative purchases?

54. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to obtain the most economical purchase?

55. Do procurement procedures analyze lease versus purchase alternatives?

56. Does the process provide transparency in reporting what was purchased?

The following questions pertain to the DOE Monitor’s review of the sub-grantee’s monitoring of work done in the field. DOE Monitors should review documentation of inspections at the local agencies.

57. Name of local agency visited by DOE Monitor with Sub-grantee Monitor:

58. What was the total production of weatherized units by this sub-grantee agency during the most recently completed year?

59. What is the production goal for the sub-grantee agency during the current year?

* 60. What percentage of this sub-grantee agency’s weatherized units was inspected last year?

* 61. What was the level of the quality of work on the units inspected: excellent, good, acceptable, poor, or unacceptable?

* 62. List findings, if any, and define whether findings were major or minor:

63. Does the Grantee use a field guide or program standards document that describes how work is to be performed in the field? (Monitors will review the guide and describe any deficiencies if they exist.)

64. Please describe how the work performed is monitored against this guide to ensure compliance.

65. Describe what action is taken if work practices are deemed non-compliant.

66. Describe the plan for performing quality inspections of all weatherized units completed.

67. Does the Grantee have up-to-date, DOE-approved energy audits or priority lists for subgrantees to use, and are they being appropriately used with regular reviews and updates for material and labor costs, climate, and unit characteristics, for:
   a. Single Family Units
   b. Mobile Homes
   c. Multi-Family Units
68. What was the date that the audits or priority lists were most recently approved by DOE?

69. Are the input variables updated at the sub-grantee level (e.g. costs for materials and labor, weather, unit characteristics, etc.) bi-annually, or at least annually at a minimum?

*70. What procedures are in place to ensure the auditors are qualified, such as certification or number of required training hours, before hiring or within a certain period after employment?

71. Is the type of monitor included (i.e. State staff, sub-contractor, monitor assigned to agency)?

*72. What is the progress toward meeting the goal of inspecting 5% of weatherized units annually? If lagging, please explain.
   a. Has the percentage of units that are post-inspections been included?
   b. Has the percentage of units that are work in progress been included?
   c. Are at least 5% of the homes that will be weatherized included in the tracking or monitoring plan?

73. Has a system been developed to track the progress of each funded project or activity?

74. Does the system include a timetable with scheduled completion dates?

75. If problems were found during inspection of the 5% of homes, per guidance, were additional inspections added?

76. What is the method used by the Grantee to verify actual energy savings, by methods such as collecting BTU energy savings data by fuel source, energy bills, etc. or by conducting a post audit inspection?

_The following questions pertain to Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA)._

77. Do sub-grantees report all training completed, and any certifications received or renewed, by crew members and contractor staff to the Grantee?

78. What is the Grantee’s method to determine the T&TA needs of sub-grantees and to allocate T&TA funds appropriately?

79. Describe how the Grantee ensures that the sub-grantees receive adequate training in all of the following areas:
   a. Technical Training
   b. Program Management Training
   c. Procurement Training
   d. Sub-contracting Training
   e. Inventory Control Training
f. Health and Safety
  g. Davis Bacon compliance

80. Are the T&TA activities that were described in the State Plan occurring?

81. Is sufficient funding and emphasis being provided by the Grantee for Grantee and subgrantee staff to attend training conferences and workshops, as emphasized by DOE? *The following questions pertain to Grantee/sub-grantee plan for Health and Safety.*

82. Is the Grantee appropriately following their Health and Safety plan? If no, please explain.

*83. Is the Grantee monitoring implementation by the sub-grantees of the Health and Safety requirements outlined in the State Plan?*

84. Have all pertinent Grantee and sub-grantee staff received the required health and safety training?

*The following questions pertain to weatherization of rental properties.*

85. Are rental units being weatherized under the DOE Weatherization Grant?

86. Does the State require the sub-grantee to utilize a standard agreement with the landlord? If so, please make it available.

*The following questions pertain to Grantee/sub-grantee properly reporting information about vendors.*

87. Does the Grantee/Subgrantee have a system in place to identify vendors who are receiving more than $25,000 of Recovery Act funds?

88. For any vendor receiving more than $25,000 in Recovery Act funds, has the Grantee/subgrantee properly reported the vendor’s identity by reporting a DUNS number or name and zip code for the vendor’s headquarters?

*89. Does the Grantee/sub-grantee maintain details and documentation of all payments to the vendor, and descriptions of what was obtained for services rendered by the vendor?*

*The following questions pertain to Grantee/sub-grantee procedures to ensure good data quality.*

90. Are information systems in place that have the capacity to handle Recovery Act reporting requirements?

91. What steps are the Grantees taking to ensure the sub-grantees report to www.federalreporting.gov?
92. Has the Grantee/sub-grantee missed one or more reporting deadlines? If so, what steps has the Grantee taken to correct the problem?

*The following questions pertain to job creation estimates by Grantees/sub-grantees.*

93. Is the Grantee estimating and reporting jobs created and retained for each project and activity, consistent with the requirements of OMB Guidance?

94. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee ensuring that jobs are not double counted as both created and retained?

95. Is the Grantee reporting only direct jobs created or retained, and not indirect jobs created or retained, in their jobs total?

96. Is the Grantee reporting only jobs that are attributable to Recovery Act funds?

97. Is the Grantee reporting the cumulative total of jobs created or retained for the reporting period as well as the year-to-date total?

98. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee describing its employment impact in narrative form?

99. Is the Grantee properly calculating jobs estimates expressed in "full-time equivalents"?

*100. Is the Grantee collecting and reporting sub-grantees’ job creation estimates and actual numbers?*

*The following questions pertain to DOE requirements for retention of records.*

101. Are there established procedures to ensure that records will be retained for at least three years after closeout of the grant?

102. Are records properly disposed of at the end of the retention period?

*The following questions pertain to Grantee procedures for the identification and dissemination of best practices.*

103. Does the Grantee have any best practices identified that they would like to share?

104. Does the Grantee identify and report success stories to DOE?

* - Denotes Critical Question
4. **SEP Desktop Checklist Questions**

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s ability to follow the basic administrative requirements of SEP, and whether they have submitted their required forms and reports on time.

* 1. Has Grantee submitted all required reports to DOE on time?  
   * a. Program Status Report (quarterly)  
   * b. ARRA Performance Progress Report (quarterly)  
   * c. EPAct Goal (Section 123) data and required information from FOA section 10.3A (annually)  
   * e. Weekly Financial Activity Report (weekly for project life)  
   * f. Annual Indirect Cost Proposal (annually)  
   * g. Database Management (monthly, over span of the award)

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s Management Progress Report. The Grantee is required to submit regularly scheduled progress reports to DOE that provide a concise narrative assessment of the status of work being done. The Monitor should compare items and activities in progress report with those in the Grantee’s State Plan to ascertain whether Grantee is meeting its goals, how well the Grantee is following its plan, and whether Grantee is on track to fulfill the requirements of the grant.

2. Does the DOE award number, name of the recipient, Worksheet Narrative titles and name of the official State Contact on the Progress Report match those on the Grantee’s approved State Plan?

3. Does the Grantee list their actual accomplishments, including major activities, significant results, major findings or conclusions, key outcomes or other achievements?

4. Did the Grantee provide a Schedule Status that lists milestones, anticipated completion dates and actual completion dates?

* 5. Does a review of the Grantee’s actual accomplishments show that they are meeting the goals and objectives for the reporting period? If not, please explain why the established goals were not met and how the goals and objectives will be met in the future.

6. Did the Grantee provide a cost status showing approved budget, by budget period and actual costs incurred?

* 7. Do actual costs incurred track with Grantee’s approved budget schedule? (i.e., if Grantee has expended 50% of funds, have they completed 50% of the work?)

*8. Have the approach, goals or objectives remained the same and without changes? If no, please provide reasons for the changes listed. Note: Any significant changes to the objectives and scope require prior approval by the Contracting Officer.
9. Is the work progressing without any actual or anticipated problems or delays? If there are actual or anticipated problems or delays, describe actions taken or planned to resolve them.

10. Were there activity products or technology transfer activities accomplished during the reporting period listed?

11. Is the Grantee’s project completion process free of significant backlogs?

12. Based on work completed to date, is the Grantee on track to be within budget, on schedule, and meet their overall goals as stated in their plan, by program completion? If not, explain.

13. Have the key personnel remained the same in this reporting period?

14. Are job metrics reported on track with the approved plan (jobs created and retained) at the State and local levels?

15. Do the actual expenditures in the Program Status Report reflect the amounts projected to be spent in the Grantee’s Budget? If no, please explain how expenditures significantly deviate from the plan.

16. Is Grantee able to produce records such as receipts and invoices of all expenditures?

17. Are key metrics accurately reported for each project activity undertaken by Grantee?

18. What bases or methods are used to compute reported metrics?

19. Are equipment purchases and use proper and in compliance? If non-compliant, please explain.

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s Recovery Act Progress Report.

20. Have the Grantees and sub-grantees registered on www.federalreporting.gov in order to submit Recovery Act reporting requirements to OMB?

21. Is the Grantee prepared to submit a report to www.federalreporting.gov on the use of Recovery Act funding, no later than the 10th day after the end of each calendar quarter (beginning the quarter ending September 30, 2009)?

22. Are the basic information requirements complete?
   a. Total amount of ARRA funds received
   b. Total amount of ARRA funds expended or obligated to projects
   c. Name and description of each project or activity
d. Completion status of project or activity (e.g., Active, Completed, Dropped and % of work completed)

e. Recovery Act metrics (i.e., energy savings, jobs, etc.)

f. Infrastructure investments made by State and local governments, purpose, total cost, rationale, and name of agency contact

g. Information on subcontracts or subgrants awarded by recipient

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s Recovery Act Performance metrics.

* 23. Is the Grantee on track according to their plan for meeting Recovery Act performance goals for Energy use reductions and/or renewable energy generated?

* 24. Is the Grantee on track according to their plan for meeting their Recovery Act performance goals for Green House Gas emissions reductions?

* 25. Is the Grantee on track for meeting their Recovery Act performance goals for jobs created or retained?

26. Is the Grantee on track for meeting their Recovery Act performance goals for cost savings?

The following questions pertain to the Grantee meeting their milestones.

27. Does the Grantee have milestones defined for the SEP Recovery Act program activities?

28. Has the Grantee reported their status in meeting each milestone in the Grantee’s plan?

*29. Is the Grantee meeting their milestones? If not, explain.

The following questions pertain to the Grantee procedures for measurement and verification

30. Has the Grantee received DOE guidance for project improving estimates and identifying baselines?

31. If so, did the Grantee apply DOE provided guidance? If not, explain.

32. Does the Grantee have access to data sources to support the methodology being used? If data is not available, when is data expected?

* - Denotes Critical Question
5. **SEP On-site Checklist Questions**

*The following question pertains to DOE’s Desktop Review of the Grantee.*

1. Please describe any issues that have been identified in the desktop monitoring that should be addressed during the on-site visit.

*The following questions pertain to section 410 of the Recovery Act - "the Governors Assurance File" provision.*

2. Is the State regulatory authority taking steps to implement in appropriate proceedings for each electric and gas utility ratemaking procedures to ensure that:
   *a.* A general policy that ensures that utility financial incentives are aligned with helping their customers use energy more efficiently and
   *b.* That provides timely cost recovery and a timely earnings opportunity for utilities associated with cost-effective measurable and verifiable efficiency savings, in a way that sustains or enhances utility customers’ incentives to use energy more efficiently?

3. Is the State implementing, or have they already implemented, residential building energy code(s) that meet or exceed the most recent International Energy Conservation Code or achieves equal or greater energy savings?

4. Is the State implementing, or has it already implemented, commercial building energy code(s) that meet or exceed ASHRAE 90.1 2007, or achieves equal or greater energy savings?

5. What is the current rate of compliance with the new residential and commercial building codes?

6. Has the State adopted a plan to ensure that 90% of new residential and commercial buildings comply with codes within eight years?

7. Describe the State’s training and enforcement systems for the building codes.

8. Are the training and enforcement systems sufficient to achieve the objectives of 90% compliance within eight years?

9. Is the State prioritizing their SEP dollars to fund energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, including expanding existing programs and supporting cooperative interstate programs?

*The following questions pertain to Davis Bacon requirements.*

---
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10. Is Grantee aware of which labor and wage requirements apply to their activities?

11. Is Grantee complying with labor and wage requirements (i.e. fair labor laws, Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws, etc.)?

* 12. Have sub-grantees submitted weekly payrolls?

* 13. Are payroll records on site in the State office?

The following questions pertain to Buy American Act requirements.

14. Is the Grantee ensuring that their purchasing procedures and the sub-grantee’s purchasing procedures are compliant with "Buy American?"

*15. Are records kept on site in the State office demonstrating this compliance?

The following questions pertain to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

* 16. Is the Grantee complying with any applicable NEPA conditions in the Grant? If not, explain.

The following questions pertain to the National Historical Preservation Act.

17. Is the Grantee complying with any applicable National Historical Preservation Act conditions in the Grant? If not, explain.

The following questions pertain to the funding limitations and prohibitions.

18. For regular annual base grant (non-Recovery Act) SEP funds, is the Grantee complying with the requirement that no more than 20% of the SEP grant can go to purchase equipment (demonstration projects of commercially-available renewable and energy efficiency technologies are not subject to this limit)?

19. Is the Grantee complying with regulations that allow ARRA SEP funds to supplement, but not supplant, State energy activities under the SEP?

* 20. Is the Grantee complying with regulations prohibiting SEP funding for the following:

* a. Construction, such as construction of mass transit systems and exclusive bus lanes, or for construction or repair of buildings or structure;
* b. Purchase of land, a building or structure or any interest therein;
* c. Subsidizing fares for public transportation;
* d. Subsidizing utility rate demonstrations or State tax credits for energy conservation measures or renewable energy measures;
*e. Conducting, or purchase equipment to conduct, research, development or demonstration of energy efficiency or renewable energy techniques and technologies not commercially available

21. Is the Grantee complying with the requirement that any regular or revolving loan mechanisms funding SEP services are consistent with the SEP Regulations and which are included in the State's approved SEP plan?

22. Do all loan documents ensure repayment of principal and interest within a reasonable period of time, and not include provisions of loan forgiveness?

23. Is the Grantee complying with the requirement that buildings owned or leased by the United States are not eligible for energy efficiency measures or renewable energy measures under SEP?

24. Is the Grantee complying with the requirement that SEP funds not be used to supplant weatherization activities under the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons, under 10 CFR part 440?

25. Is the Grantee complying with the requirement that loan guarantees are not allowed to fund the purchase and installation of materials and equipment?

The following questions pertain to the Grantee’s written financial operations manual, which outlines how they handle their financial management.

26. Does the Grantee have a written financial operations manual?

* 27. Does the Grantee’s written financial operation manual contain adequate information addressing:
  * a. Segregation of duties
  * b. Accounting standards and practices
  * c. Payment procedures
  * d. Approval authority
  * e. Record keeping requirements

The following questions pertain to the adequacy of the financial management system to ascertain whether they have an adequate system in place.

28. Does Grantee’s financial management system meet the requirements of 10 CFR 600.220?

29. What system does the Grantee use for comparing expenditures to budgeted amounts?

* 30. Are expenditures for project activities and administration being tracked separately?

* 31. Is the Grantee’s financial management system capable of tracking and reporting Recovery Act funds separately from leveraged/other funds?
32. Are indirect costs claimed?
   a. If so, are they being charged and allocated properly?

* 33. Does the Grantee use periodic financial reports as a management control tool?

34. How frequently are audits completed?

35. Who conducts the audits?

36. When was the last financial audit conducted?

37. Are SEP grants funded by both annual appropriations and the Recovery Act specifically reviewed in the audit?

38. Is there a system in place that tracks auditing findings, recommendations, and corrective actions?

* 39. Are there any findings specific to SEP found in the most recent audit report? If so, please summarize.

40. Does the Grantee carryover funding from one fiscal year to the next?

* 41. For regular SEP grants funded with annual appropriations (i.e., non-Recovery Act), are carryover balances less than 25% of prior year Federal formula allocation?
   * a. If so, is there a plan in place to address how these balances will be reduced?

42. Has a system been developed to track the progress of each funded project or activity?

43. Does the tracking system include a timetable with scheduled completion dates?
   The following questions pertain to the funds distribution to sub-grantees.

44. Has the Grantee developed a sub-granting process that expeditiously allocates funding?

*45. Has the Grantee developed a sub-granting process that identifies waste, fraud, and abuse?

46. Has the Grantee developed a sub-granting process that generates timely and accurate reporting?

47. Do sub-grantees report cost, schedule and work completion information to the Grantee on a regular basis?

48. Are subgrants, if any, being properly distributed by the Grantee according to State procurement rules?
* 49. Is the Grantee meeting the Requirements of 10 CFR 600.237?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of sub-grantees. Under the SEP, Grantees are expected to monitor their sub-grantees.

50. Does the Grantee have a guide for monitoring the sub-grantee performance? (Monitors will review the guide and describe any deficiencies if they exist.)

51. Does the monitoring guide cover all areas found in the sub-grantee’s contract and the Grantee’s plan, and all applicable Federal regulations and program guidance documents?

52. Are the current contracts and any amendments between the Grantee and sub-grantees signed and properly executed by both parties?

53. How often is Grantee conducting monitoring of sub-grantees?

*54. Have all issues, perceived issues and potential issues, as determined by the Grantee, been raised with the sub-grantee? If no, explain below.
   * a. If yes, have they been resolved?

55. Has sub-grantee provided required reports on its client education activities?

*56. Are sanctions imposed for sub-grantees that fail to comply with program requirements?

57. Are there procedures in place for the Grantee to ensure that sub-recipients maintain adequate documentation and monitoring of personnel issues such as timesheets, time allocations, and leave, etc?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s personnel.

58. Are Grantee personnel paid from a single source of funds? If not, explain.

59. Is staff time being properly recorded against the grant they are working on?

*60. Has DOE been notified of any personnel being charged to more than one grant?

61. Are all Grantee personnel to be paid with grant funds accounted for on the Grantee’s organizational chart?

*62. Has the organizational structure remained unchanged since the grant was awarded?
   * a. If it has changed, has this been amended in the State Plan or reported to the Project Officer?

63. Are personnel policies on job classification, time and attendance, leave and overtime established in writing, and distributed to employees?
64. Is there an established process for determining whether costs incurred by staff are allowable?

65. Do the work hours estimated in the Grantee Plan appear to match the actual hours spent working on the Program? If there is a discrepancy, please explain.

*66. Are key personnel actually performing the duties originally proposed, if applicable (e.g. key personnel identified in the grant application)?

*67. Are processes in place to ensure that no more than 100% of time is charged per employee?
   *a. If not, are there any personnel listed in the Plans or Progress Report with greater than 100% utilization?

68. If needed, are there hiring plans in place for program administrators for the Plan?

69. If needed, are there hiring plans in place for program technical experts for the Plan?

*70. Does the Grantee believe it has sufficient staffing to meet requirements and goals? If no, describe below how staffing issues are being resolved.
   * a. If not, has this been discussed with the management in charge of overseeing hiring decisions?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of all vehicles and equipment.

71. Does the Grantee have a master inventory list of vehicles and equipment?

72. Are there written procedures covering the inventory, maintenance, and disposition of vehicles/equipment?

73. Is there a process in place to ensure that purchases or leases-to-purchase meet all financial and program requirements, including DOE prior approval, where applicable?

* 74. Are there safeguards in place to ensure that vehicle/equipment costs are charged to the appropriate program (and category)?

75. Are all vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds used for only this Program (i.e., fulltime use)?

* 76. If vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds are going to be used for non-program purposes (i.e., part time use), is it clearly documented what the other programs are and what portion of the cost is from state energy funds?

77. Are the vehicles/equipment currently being used appropriate and adequate for the job and do they ensure cost-effective delivery of services?
78. Has a physical inventory of equipment been taken and the results reconciled with the property records within the last two years?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s procurement process.

*79. Is the procurement process established in writing and distributed to employees?

80. Does the procurement process clearly separate duties as they pertain to SEP procurement activities?

81. Is the Grantee following State’s procurement standards?

82. Is there a clear process for determining the use and selection of sub-grantees?

*83. Does the Grantee review procurements of sub-contractors to ensure full and open competition?

84. Are efforts made to ensure fairness in bidding and contracting procedures with small businesses, women’s business enterprises, and minority-owned firms, pursuant to Federal law?

85. Is there a documented process and timeframe for issuing solicitations and making awards?

86. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to avoid unnecessary or duplicative purchases?

*87. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to obtain the most economical purchase?

88. Do procurement procedures analyze lease versus purchase alternatives?

*89. Does the process provide transparency in reporting what was purchased?

The following questions pertain to Grantee/sub-grantee properly reporting information about vendors.

90. Is the Grantee complying with Section 1512 of the Recovery Act (June 22, 2009 OMB Memo)?

91. Is the Grantee complying with reporting specified on the Reporting Requirement Checklist?

92. Is Grantee/sub-grantee doing business with a vendor who is receiving more than $25,000 of Recovery Act funds?
a. For any vendor receiving more than $25,000 in Recovery Act funds, has the Grantee/sub-grantee properly reported the vendor’s identity by reporting a DUNS number or name and zip code for the vendor’s headquarters?

b. Does the Grantee/sub-grantee maintain details and documentation of all payments to the vendor, and descriptions of what was obtained for services rendered by the vendor?

93. Are information systems in place that can handle the capacity of SEP reporting requirements?

94. Does the Grantee have measures in place to review the quality of data its sub-grantees report to www.federalreporting.gov?

95. Has the Grantee demonstrated that they have no systemic or chronic reporting problems?

* 96. Has the Grantee demonstrated that they have no systemic or chronic deficiencies in meeting its responsibilities to review and identify the data quality problems of sub-grantees, consistent with requirements of OMB Guidance?

* 97. Has the Grantee/sub-grantee taken action to correct any reporting problems identified by DOE?

_The following questions pertain to job creation estimates by Grantees/sub-grantees._

* 98. Is the Grantee estimating and reporting jobs created and retained for each project and activity, consistent with the requirements of OMB Guidance?

* 99. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee ensuring that jobs are not double counted as both created and retained?

* 100. Is the Grantee reporting only direct jobs created or retained, and not indirect jobs created or retained, in their jobs total?

* 101. Is the Grantee reporting only jobs that are attributable to Recovery Act funds?

* 102. Is the Grantee reporting the cumulative total of jobs created or retained for the reporting period as well as the year-to-date total?

* 103. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee describing its employment impact in narrative form?

* 104. Is the Grantee properly calculating jobs estimates expressed in "full-time equivalents"?

* 105. Is the Grantee collecting and reporting sub-grantees’ job creation estimates and actual numbers?
The following questions pertain to DOE requirements for retention of records.

106. Are there established procedures to ensure that records will be retained for at least three years after delivery of the final report to DOE?

107. Are records properly disposed of at the end of the retention period?

The following questions pertain to EPACT 2005 requirements.

108. Is each activity being undertaken by the Grantee in their energy conservation plan (State Plan) clearly linked to a goal in their State Plan?

109. Is the Grantee on track to meet the EPACT 2005 goal of at least 25 percent improvement in energy efficiency in the State by 2012 over 1990 levels?

The following questions pertain to Grantee procedures for the identification and dissemination of best practices.

110. Does the Grantee have any best practices identified that they would like to share?

111. Does the Grantee identify and report success stories to DOE?

The following question pertains to annual metrics reporting.

112. Is the Grantee providing critical annual reporting metrics as required by Funding Opportunity Guidance DE-FOA-0000052 issued April 24, 2009, and resultant Grant?

The following questions pertain to Grantee procedures for measurement and verification. These questions are to be completed only if DOE has issued guidance for improving estimates and identifying baselines for measurement and verification. The Monitor should check with OWIP to determine if this has occurred.

113. Has the Grantee applied DOE provided guidance for improving estimates and identifying baselines for measurement and verification? If not, explain.

114. Does the Grantee have access to data sources to support the methodology being used? If not, explain.

* - Denotes Critical Question
6. **EECBG Desktop Checklist Questions**

*(Answers are generally yes/no but add any contextual information as required.)*

1. * Has the Grantee provided all required reports on time and were they complete and accurate?

*The following questions have to do with the Grantee reports in Federalreporting.gov (ARRA 1512)*

2. * Did the Grantee submit a report to Federalreporting.gov on time and was it complete and accurate?
3. Were there any unresolved issues or discrepancies with the Federalreporting.gov report? If yes, please describe
4. Has the issue been resolved after the close of the reporting period?

*The following questions pertain to the Grantee's Quarterly Project Performance Report in PAGE*

5. * For each activity, did the Grantee list their Recovery Act Performance Metrics, are they reasonable, and is the Grantee on track to meet the goals for these metrics for the reporting period?
6. * Is the Grantee following their DOE-approved Plan for this reporting period? If not, have they obtained prior authorization from the Project Officer for any variances to their DOE-approved Plan?
7. * Did the Grantee actually accomplish what they planned to accomplish for this reporting period?
8. * For each activity, do the expenditures, compared with the total award amount and the percentage of work completed, show that the Grantee is on track financially (e.g. is the % of work completed at a level to be reasonably expected for % of money spent)?
9. * Do the Grantee's administrative expenses appear to be reasonable for this reporting period?
10. * For Grantees establishing Revolving Loan Funds: do their expenses for their Revolving Loan Fund appear to be reasonable for this reporting period?
11. * Do the Grantee's subgranting costs (if any) appear to be reasonable for this reporting period?
12. Is the Grantee actually leveraging funds? Briefly describe the leveraging

*The following questions pertain to the Grantee meeting their milestones.*

13. * Has the Grantee set approved milestones in PAGE?
14. * Are they meeting their milestones?
The following questions pertain to potential issues arising from earlier reviews.

15. * For any issue that had a significant impact on the project, has the Grantee submitted any additional or subsequent information?
16. * Based on this issue, is the Grantee still on track to be within budget, on schedule, and meet their overall goals as stated in their plan, by program completion?

The following question pertains to the Grantee overall.

17. Based on your assessment of the overall quality and completeness of the Grantee's reporting and performance, and your interactions with them during this reporting period, should the Grantee receive a prioritized on-site visit?

* - Denotes Critical Question
7. **EECBG On-site Checklist Questions**

The following question pertains to DOE’s Desktop Review of the Grantee.

1. Please describe any issues that have been identified in the desktop monitoring that should be addressed during the on-site visit.

State Grantees Only: The following questions pertain to Grantee’s Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy (EECS) that they must submit with their application.

* 2. Is the State varying significantly from the approved strategy in its EECS?

3. Is the State following their process, as stated in their EECS, for providing subgrants to units of local government that are ineligible for the formula-based EECBG?

4. Is the process for choosing sub-grantees transparent and fair and is the State communicating the process to potential sub-grantees?

5. Is the strategy being followed likely to ensure that it sustains benefits beyond the EECBG funding period?

Local and Tribal Grantees Only: The following questions pertain to Grantee’s Energy Efficiency and Conservation Strategy (EECS)

6. Is the Grantee varying significantly from the strategy in its EECS?

7. Is the strategy being followed likely to ensure that it sustains benefits beyond the EECBG funding period?

The following questions pertain to Davis-Bacon requirements.

8. Is Grantee aware of which labor and wage requirements apply to their activities?

9. Is Grantee complying with labor and wage requirements (e.g., fair labor laws, Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws)?

* 10. Have sub-grantees submitted weekly payrolls?

* 11. Are payroll records on site in the State office?

The following questions pertain to Buy American Act requirements.

* 12. Is the Grantee ensuring that their purchasing procedures and the sub-grantee’s purchasing procedures are compliant with “Buy American?”
* 13. Are records kept on site in the State office demonstrating this compliance?

The following questions pertain to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

* 14. Is the Grantee complying with all NEPA conditions in the Grant? If not, explain.

The following questions pertain to the National Historical Preservation Act.

15. Is the Grantee complying with any applicable National Historical Preservation Act conditions in the Grant? If not, explain.

The following questions pertain to the State Grantee’s distribution to sub-grantees.

* 16. Is the State distributing at least 60 percent of its EECBG funding to units of local government in the State that are NOT eligible for direct EECBG formula grants?

* a. What is the process the Grantee has developed to allocate funding in an expeditious manner?

* 17. Has the Grantee developed a process to prevent fraudulent spending?

* a. Explain.

18. Has the Grantee developed a process that generates timely and accurate reporting?

a. Explain.

* 19. Has the State awarded all subgrants within 180 days of the date on which the DOE approved their EECS?

20. Do sub-grantees report cost, schedule and work completion information to the Grantee on a regular basis?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s written financial operations manual, which outlines how they handle their financial management.

21. Does the Grantee have a written financial operations manual?

* 22. Does the Grantee’s written financial operations manual contain adequate information addressing:

   * a. Segregation of duties
   
   * b. Accounting standards and practices
   
   * c. Payment procedures
The following pertains to the performance of the Financial System and Financial Monitoring.

23. Does the Grantee use periodic financial reports as a management control tool?

24. Does the Grantee have a regular audit performed by a qualified firm?

25. Will the EECBG grant be reviewed in the upcoming audit?

26. Is there a system in place that tracks auditing findings, projections, recommendations, and corrective actions?

27. Has a system been developed to track the progress of each funded project or activity?

28. Based on work completed to date, is the Grantee on track to obligate EECBG funds within 18 months and spend within 36 months of award?

29. Is the Grantee’s financial monitoring system capable of tracking and reporting Recovery Act funds separately from leveraged/other funds?

30. Can the Grantee/sub-grantee track a single expenditure through the accounting system by:

   a. Fund code?

   b. Type of transaction?

   c. Amount?

   d. Fund source?

31. Are all costs in the Grantee/sub-grantee’s budget reasonable, allowable, and allocable according to the correct cost principles (e.g. OMB A-87 for governments, A-122 for nonprofit organizations, and A-102 for educational institutions)?

32. If the Grantee/sub-grantee has a carryover from one fiscal year to the next, are carryover balances less than 25% of prior year allocation?
* 33. If the Grantee/sub-grantee has a carryover from one fiscal year to the next, is there a plan in place to address how these balances will be reduced?

34. Does the Grantee have an adequate system for comparing expenditures to budgeted amounts?
   a. How does the Grantee compare expenditures to budgeted amounts?

35. Is there any budgeted amount that does not have a corresponding expenditure?
   a. Explain.

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of sub-grantees. Under the EECBG, Grantees are expected to monitor their sub-grantees.

36. Does the Grantee have a guide for monitoring of sub-grantee performance?

37. Does the monitoring guide cover all areas covered by the sub-grantee’s contract and the Grantee’s plan?

38. Has a system been developed to track the progress of each funded project or activity?
   a. Does the system include a timetable with scheduled completion dates?

39. Does the Grantee maintain written procedures describing its management of the program?

40. Are the current contracts between the Grantee and sub-recipients signed and properly executed by both parties?

41. Has the Grantee obtained a DUNS number and registered their sub-grantee with the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) system, as appropriate?

42. Does the Grantee have a process to ensure that all sub-grantees comply with EECBG requirements?

* 43. Have all issues, perceived issues and potential issues, as determined by the Grantee, been raised with the sub-grantee?

* 44. Are sanctions imposed for sub-grantees/sub-contractors that fail to comply with program requirements?

45. Does the Grantee have procedures in place to ensure that regular reporting is completed accurately and submitted on time?
The following questions pertain to Grantee’s personnel.

46. Are Grantee personnel paid from a single source of funds? If not, explain.

47. Is staff time being properly recorded against the grant they are working on?

*48. Has DOE been notified of any personnel being charged to more than one grant?

49. Are all Grantee personnel to be paid with grant funds accounted for on the Grantee’s organizational chart?

* 50. Has the organizational structure remained unchanged since the grant was awarded?
    * a. If it has changed, has this been amended in the State Plan or reported to the Project Officer?

51. Are personnel policies on job classification, time and attendance, leave and overtime established in writing, and distributed to employees?

52. Is there an established process for determining whether costs incurred by staff are allowable?

53. Do the work hours estimated in the Grantee Plan appear to match the actual hours spent working on the Program? If there is a discrepancy, please explain.

* 54. Are key personnel identified in the grant application actually performing the duties originally proposed, if applicable?

* 55. Are processes in place to ensure that no more than 100% of time is charged per employee?
    * a. If not, are there any personnel listed in the Plans or Progress Report with greater than 100% utilization?

56. If needed, are there hiring plans in place for program administrators for the Plan?

57. If needed, are there hiring plans in place for program technical experts for the Plan?

* 58. Does the Grantee believe it has sufficient staffing to meet requirements and goals?
    * a. If not, has this been discussed with the management in charge of overseeing hiring decisions?
    * b. Describe below how staffing issues are being resolved.

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s monitoring of all vehicles and equipment.
59. Does the Grantee have a master inventory list of vehicles and equipment?

60. Are there written procedures covering the inventory, maintenance, and disposition of vehicles/equipment?

61. Is there a process in place to ensure that purchases or leases-to-purchase meet all financial and program requirements, including DOE prior approval, where applicable?

62. Are there safeguards in place to ensure that vehicle/equipment costs are charged to the appropriate program (and category)?

63. Are all vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds used for only this Program (i.e., fulltime use)?

*64. If vehicles/equipment purchased with grant funds are going to be used for non-program purposes (i.e., part time use), is it clearly documented what the other programs are and what portion of the cost is from state energy funds?

65. Are the vehicles/equipment currently being used appropriate and adequate for the job and do they ensure cost-effective delivery of services?

*66. Has a physical inventory of equipment been taken and the results reconciled with the property records within the last two years?

67. If the equipment has a per-unit fair market value of $5,000 or more, does the inventory list include all the necessary information and description of the equipment?

*68. Are all unforeseen purchases (those not in the Grantee’s original budget) greater than $5,000 approved by the DOE Project Officer prior to purchase?

The following questions pertain to Grantee’s procurement process.

69. Is the procurement process established in writing and distributed to employees?

70. Does the procurement process clearly separate duties as they pertain to EECBG procurement activities?

71. Is the Grantee following State’s procurement standards?

72. Is there a clear process for determining the use and selection of sub-grantees?

*73. Does the Grantee review procurements of sub-contractors to ensure full and open competition?
74. Are efforts made to ensure fairness in bidding and contracting procedures with small businesses, women’s business enterprises, and minority-owned firms, pursuant to Federal law?

75. Is there a documented process and timeframe for issuing solicitations and making awards?

76. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to avoid unnecessary or duplicative purchases?

77. Do procurement procedures provide cost controls to obtain the most economical purchase?

78. Do procurement procedures analyze lease versus purchase alternatives?

* 79. Does the process provide transparency in reporting what was purchased?

The following questions pertain to Grantee procedures for the identification and dissemination of best practices.

80. Does the Grantee have any best practices identified that they would like to share?

81. Does the Grantee identify and report success stories to DOE

The following questions pertain to Grantee/sub-grantee properly reporting information about vendors.

82. Is the Grantee complying with Section 1512 of the Recovery Act (June 22, 2009 OMB Memo)?

83. Is the Grantee complying with reporting specified on the Reporting Requirement Checklist?

* 84. Is Grantee/sub-grantee doing business with a vendor who is receiving more than $25,000 of Recovery Act funds?

  * a. For any vendor receiving more than $25,000 in Recovery Act funds, has the Grantee/sub-grantee properly reported the vendor’s identity by reporting a DUNS number or name and zip code for the vendor’s headquarters?

  * b. Does the Grantee/sub-grantee maintain details and documentation of all payments to the vendor, and descriptions of what was obtained for services rendered by the vendor?

85. Are information systems in place that can handle the capacity of EECBG reporting requirements?
86. Does the Grantee have measures in place to review the quality of data its sub-grantees report to www.federalreporting.gov?

* 87. Has the Grantee demonstrated that they have no systemic or chronic reporting problems?

* 88. Has the Grantee demonstrated that they have no systemic or chronic deficiencies in meeting its responsibilities to review and identify the data quality problems of sub-grantees, consistent with requirements of OMB Guidance?

89. Has the Grantee/sub-grantee taken action to correct any reporting problems identified by DOE?

The following questions pertain to job creation estimates by Grantees/sub-grantees.

* 90. Is the Grantee estimating and reporting jobs created and retained for each project and activity, consistent with the requirements of OMB Guidance?

* 91. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee ensuring that jobs are not double counted as both created and retained?

* 92. Is the Grantee reporting only direct jobs created or retained, and not indirect jobs created or retained, in their jobs total?

* 93. Is the Grantee reporting only jobs that are attributable to Recovery Act funds?

* 94. Is the Grantee reporting the cumulative total of jobs created or retained for the reporting period as well as the year-to-date total?

* 95. Is the Grantee/sub-grantee describing its employment impact in narrative form?

* 96. Is the Grantee properly calculating jobs estimates expressed in “full-time equivalents”?

* 97. Is the Grantee collecting and reporting sub-grantees’ job creation estimates and actual numbers?

The following questions pertain to DOE requirements for retention of records.

98. Are there established procedures to ensure that records will be retained for at least three years after delivery of the final report to DOE?

99. Are records properly disposed of at the end of the retention period?
The following questions pertain to Grantee procedures for measurement and verification. These questions are to be completed only if DOE has issued guidance for improving estimates and identifying baselines for measurement and verification. The Monitor should check with OWIP to determine if this has occurred.

100. Has the Grantee applied DOE provided guidance for improving estimates and identifying baselines for measurement and verification? If not, explain.

101. Does the Grantee have access to data sources to support the methodology being used? If not, explain.

* - Denotes Critical Question