

## NIST MEP ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT

**From:** XXXX, NIST MEP Resource Manager  
XXXX, NIST MEP Federal Program Officer

**Subject:** XX<sup>th</sup> Year Annual Review

Center Information:

Legal Recipient:

Center Name: (if different from Legal Recipient)

Cooperative Agreement: 7ONANB#####

Date of Review:

Location of Review:

---

### I. Review Participants

Reviewers:

- Reviewer Name, NIST MEP Resource Manager
- Reviewer Name, NIST MEP Federal Program Officer
- Reviewer Name, NIST Grants Management Specialist
- Add other participants along with positions as appropriate

Center Representatives:

- XXXXXXXXX, Center Director
- Add other participants along with positions as appropriate

### II. Executive Summary and Project Analysis

The review of CENTER NAME completed on DATE OF REVIEW complies with the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership's (MEP) enabling legislation, 15 USC 278k, and regulation, 15 CFR 290.8 (d), published September 17, 1990 and amended April 20, 1994. The program was reviewed with respect to the areas listed below, and the Center's performance was overall judged to be <satisfactory/acceptable/unsatisfactory>. Specific comments and recommendations are made at the end of the review.

#### Section 1: Center Background

The purpose of this section is to determine whether changes are required to the Center Background description presented in the Center's FFO Response/Proposal or Operating Plan. Please indicate below if any of the background information submitted by the Center has

changed significantly during the year, or is anticipated to change in the next year to the point where the Center needs to re-submit an updated Center Background description by checking the box for yes or no. If updating is needed, please note this as part of the recommendations.

Background documents must be included with renewal packages as they are considered Required Documents. As such, the renewal timelines apply (90 days for draft; 60 days for final).

**a. Strategy, Market & Business Model**

i. Center Strategy Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

ii. Market Understanding

1) Market Segmentation Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

2) Needs Identification, Product/Service Offerings Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

iii. Business Model

1) Outreach and Service Delivery Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

2) Partnership Leverage and Linkages Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

iv. Performance Measurement and Management process/system Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

**b. Qualifications of the Applicant; Key Personnel and Organizational Structure**

i. Key Personnel<sup>1</sup>

Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

ii. Organizational Structure<sup>2</sup>

Yes  No

- Notes
- Notes

## Section 2: Operating Outcomes

The purpose of this section is to document the Center's progress towards its objectives as developed in their Operating Outcomes statement. In addition to discussing the progress the Center has made towards its objectives, please discuss any distinctive practices that might be gleaned from the Center's success. Address the Center's progress towards achieving goals for the plan submitted, challenges, risks, and opportunities.

Operating Outcomes must be included with renewal packages as they are considered Required Documents. As such, the renewal timelines apply (90 days for draft; 60 days for final).

### Center Client Activity Levels by Type of Company

**a) Client Activity levels with a focus on very small, rural, emerging, small and mid-sized enterprises (SMEs), and other manufacturers: *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Enhancing Competitiveness*.** Please discuss the Center's client Activities with Small and Mid-sized enterprises (SME's) with a particular emphasis on small, rural and start-up SME's in the most recent time period.

**b) Transformational Clients: *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Enhancing Competitiveness*.** Please discuss the Center's work with Transformational Clients in the most recent time period.

### Top and Bottom Line Growth

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note, if any of the Key Personnel have changed or will be changing the appropriate prior approval requirements must be followed as stated in the Hollings MEP General Term and Conditions.

<sup>2</sup> As part of the certification process please ensure that the Oversight Board meets the current Hollings MEP General Terms and Conditions.

**a) Engagement in “Top Line Growth”:** *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Enhancing Competitiveness.*  
Please discuss the Center’s work in Top Line Growth in the most recent time period.

**b) Engagement in “Bottom Line Growth”:** *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Enhancing Competitiveness.*  
Please discuss the Center’s work in Bottom Line Growth in the most recent time period.

**c) Making New Technologies Available:** *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Enhancing Competitiveness.*  
Please discuss the Center’s work in making new technologies available in the most recent timeperiod.

**d) Other Key Initiative of the Center:** *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Support National, State, and Regional Manufacturing Eco-Systems and Partnerships.* Please discuss the Center’s work in supporting the NIST MEP Strategic Goal to support national, state, and regional manufacturing eco-systems and partnerships.

**e) Board Development:** *NIST MEP Strategic Goal; Serve as Voice to and Voice for Manufacturers.* Please discuss the Center’s board activities to support serving as the voice to and voice for manufacturers.

**f) Performance Measures.** Please discuss the Center’s performance measures using the data set attached. Is the Center performing acceptably against their goals and objectives? Provide any explanation for performance against goals that are much lower than expected or much higher. Staff Development and Capabilities: Discuss any progress or changes to broaden and improve the Center’s competencies.

**Section 3: Financial Performance**

The purpose of this section is to discuss the Center’s performance against its approved budget, and to determine whether updates to the existing budget are necessary. This section will also help the Center identify what documentation must be submitted to NIST MEP to update its cooperative agreement and renew the award. Revisions to any of the information below require updated forms and prior approval. All Federal forms should align with the detailed budget tables and narrative.

	<b>Federal Forms</b>	<b>When to Submit</b>	<b>Questions to Ask</b>	<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	SF-424 “Application for Federal Assistance” (CFDA #11.611)	As applicable	Has any information from your initial submission changed? <i>If so, submit a revised form.</i>		
2	Five-Year Budget Summary Table	Update Required Annually	Have prior year or future year budgets changed based on the most recent financial performance of the center? <i>If so, submit a request using the current template.</i>  <i>*Note that, unless specifically requested, changes to prior year budgets should be reflected in the Five-Year Budget Summary Table only. Centers are not required to submit revised detailed budget workbooks to reflect changes in prior years.</i>		
3	CD-511 “Certification Regarding Lobbying” (signed)	Required Annually			

4	Approved Indirect Cost Rate (IDC) Agreement or submitted IDC Rate Proposal Transmittal Letter	Required Annually, <b>as applicable</b>			
---	---	---	--	--	--

Compliance with 2 CFR 200 “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements” and the NIST MEP General Terms and Conditions is a condition for receiving NIST MEP federal assistance.

	MEP Budget Documents	When to Submit	Questions to Ask	Y/N	Comments
1	One-Year Budget Workbook for upcoming operating period(s)	As applicable	<p>1. Are you requesting to carry over Unexpended Federal Funds (UFF) from the prior operating year? Will it be used ABOVE or TOWARD base? <i>If so, submit a request on the “Revenue” tab of the most current workbook template and adjust your Five-Year Budget to reflect the carry over</i></p> <p>2. Are you requesting to carry-over Unexpended Program Income (UPI)*? <i>If so, submit a request on the “Revenue” tab of the most current workbook template and adjust your Five-Year Budget to reflect the carry over.</i></p>		

			<p>3. Have the Center’s planned revenue sources changed? <i>If so, submit a revised revenue description.</i></p> <p>4. Has the Center’s budget changed significantly or does the Center plan to make changes to the budget that were not previously approved? <i>If so, submit a revised budget narrative.</i></p>		
2	Draft proposed Subrecipient (SRA)/Third-Party Contributor (TPC) Summary Table and any associated agreements of \$150,000 or more	Required Annually, <b><i>as applicable</i></b>	Does the Center have SRA or TPC agreements with valuations of \$150,000 or more? <i>If so, submit draft agreements including detailed budget tables and narratives.</i>		
3	Draft proposed contracts with budgeted amounts of \$150,000 or more	Required Annually, <b><i>as applicable</i></b>	<p>Does the Center have contracts with valuations of \$150,000 or more? <i>If so, submit draft agreements including information on proposed pricing and fees.</i></p> <p>Does the Center have amended multiyear contracts with valuations of \$150,000 or more? <i>If so, submit draft amendment page(s) including information on proposed pricing and fees, if applicable.</i></p>		

--	--	--	--	--	--

\* Per the MEP General Terms and Conditions, carry over of UPI is limited to 50% of the total Federal amount of the award.

**Comments on the overall financial performance of the center:**

The purpose of this section is to capture any other information needed to provide insight into the overall financial performance of the center. Overall are they drawing down federal funding over the award period (five years) as anticipated, has the structure of their financial model remained the same (for instance if shifting to a brokered model is that successful), overall are they struggling financially (such as losing money year-over-year) or in a neutral or net positive position, etc. No more than one to two paragraphs.

**Funding Sources (as it relates to MEP activities) and Cost Share/Match**

Funding Sources Table -- EXAMPLE Can this be pulled from MEIS?

	<b>Year 6 Budgeted</b>	<b>Actuals for Year 6 (as of 12-31-20)</b>	<b>Percent spent in Year 6</b>
Federal Funds	\$3,410,118.00	\$1,506,638.51	44%
State and local funds	\$1,282,415.00	\$556,025.00	43%
Program Income	\$294,703.00	\$123,345.02	42%
Other-SRAs	\$1,833,000.00	\$759,945.76	41%
	<u>\$6,820,236.00</u>	<u>\$2,945,954.29</u>	43%

**Cost Share/Match Amounts**

State and local funds	\$1,282,415.00	38%
Program Income	\$294,703.00	9%
Other-SRAs	<u>\$1,833,000.00</u>	54%
	<u>\$3,410,118.00</u>	



## Other

- IDC rate
  - XXX is cognizant agency and their IDC is effective until XXXXXX
- Budget preparation and justification quality is satisfactory.
- D&B Report/Financial Risks
  - The D&B report indicates the center has a low risk in all areas but the Credit Limit Recommendation which is at a moderate risk. As the center is directly connected to the University this is not a concern.

- Notes
- Notes

### **III. Center Performance**

The outcome of the annual review finds CENTER Name operation to be satisfactory/unsatisfactory.

### **IV. Identified Areas for Improvement**

The purpose of this section is to identify any potential deficiencies that may be identified during a Panel Review. Potential deficiencies may be failure to comply with legal requirements of the award, failure to comply with financial requirements of the program, or failure to execute on critical programmatic aspects as a NIST MEP center. Potential deficiencies are significant enough that the legal, financial or programmatic health of the center is threatened if the potential deficiency is not addressed. The purpose of identifying potential deficiencies in the Annual Review is to allow the center time to address any that may be identified through the Annual Review process. Has the Center met its reporting requirements? (SF-425, Progress Narrative, etc.). Has the Center satisfied of the prior year's Special Award Conditions?

- Compliance Issue #1
- Compliance Issue #2

### **V. Identified Risks**

The purpose of this section is to make a short list of known risks, including information on corrective actions and timeframes for resolutions. Risks should be included in success plans.

- Identified Risk #1
- Identified Risk #2

### **VI. Recommendations**

The purpose of this section is to make a short list of recommendations that the Center could consider studying and/or adopting to improve their overall performance and effectiveness.

- New Recommendation #1
- New Recommendation #2

### **VII. Progress on Previous Recommendations**

The purpose of this section is to discuss progress made by the center on the major recommendations made during the last Review, if appropriate. List each recommendation and discuss the progress. If this is a first-year Annual Review, simply identify this as not applicable.

- Recommendation Progress #1
- Recommendation Progress #2

**VIII. Other Observations**

- Observation #1
- Observation #2

**IX. Attachments**

- 4-quarter CARD/impact metrics
- Standard Tables: Client Activity Goals, MEP Metrics Map, Survey Continuity

cc. Center Director  
Oversight Board Chair  
Center Director’s Supervisor, if part of a host institution  
Grants Management Specialist

**Certification: By signing this report, I certify that the financial information provided at the time of the annual review was correct to the best of my knowledge and that the Financial Performance section is accurate:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
*Center Director or Authorized Representative*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_