Subrecipient/Vendor Name	BP 1 Cost	BP 2 Cost	Total Cost	Role in Project (Identify SOPO Tasks)
[redacted]				

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Did the Recipient propose any subrecipients with total costs above $100,000? ☒ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, a separate Technical Evaluation/Negotiation Memorandum is required for each subrecipient/vendor – see below)

☐ Specialist concurs.

For awards to corporations and nonprofits*. full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $250,000 or greater than or equal to 50% of the total project costs, whichever is less.* ***For awards to Universities, States, and Local Governments****. full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $500,000 or greater than or equal to 25% of the total project costs, whichever is less.*

Full reviews consist of Tech Evaluation/Negotiation Memos covering reviews of budgets, budget justifications, and scopes of work. ***For all sub-recipients costs that are below these thresholds, projects must continue to be assessed for reasonableness on the basis of the explanation (cost and brief description of work) presented by the Recipient in their application.***

7. Construction:

Total Negotiated Construction Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Construction costs: ☒
Project Officer: The type of construction proposed in the negotiated budget is appropriate for the scope of work: ☐ The construction costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

8. Other Direct Costs:

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Total Negotiated Other Direct Costs:	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Other Direct costs: ☐
Project Officer: The types of other direct costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒ The costs proposed in the negotiated budget for other direct costs are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒ *If the negotiated other direct cost budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:*	

The other direct costs in this project relate to the storage and transportation of the finished algal oil to the refining partners. They are reasonable rates for the quantity and distance, and are necessary for the demonstrated integration of the pilot plant's process.

☐ Specialist concurs.

9. Indirect Charges:

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4 | Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Indirect Costs: ☐

Specialist:

Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____

Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____

If No, select one of the following:

☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)
List Date of review: _____

☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable

☐ Other: _____

Please fill out the following tables with the negotiated costs:

Base Item	Base Cost	Rate	Indirect Cost
Example Only: Modified Total Direct Costs	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:			

The indirect costs proposed in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

10. Cost Share:

Project Officer:

Project is a: ☐ Research ☐ Development ☐ Demonstration ☒ Other: Pilot plant

The minimum recipient's cost share required for this award is: –

The recipient proposed cost share for this award is: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

Does the proposed cost share meet the minimum requirement: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If the recipient does not meet the required cost share for this award, an explanation of the reason and authority for the reduction or waiver of the cost share requirement should be included below:

Specialist:

Is the proposed cost share: ☐ Cash ☐ In-kind (detail the amount and category below for in-kind cost share, if applicable)

	Organization	Type of Cost Share (cash or in-kind)	Cost Share Amount	Basis of Value (how the recipient calculated value)
Total				

Third Party cost share commitment letters have been obtained: ☐ (Please include letters in permanent STRIPES file)

B. The following Project Officer and Specialist evaluation and negotiation commentary and recommendations address their agreement on all additional considerations for this award.

Specialist to complete

1. Please list any other special provisions agreed upon for inclusion in this award and describe the rationale for their inclusion below.

Project Officer to complete

2. If a negotiation strategy, or strategies, is/are specified in the selection statement, provide a discussion below of how this was addressed and resolved.

Solazyme was required to cost share from to 20%. Solazyme cost share

Solazyme was required to have contingency on total project cost.

Comment [CL4]:

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

3. Any other comments or concerns of the Project Officer and/or Specialist for this award, and the recommended approach to mitigating them, will be explained and addressed below.

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 5
(Deliberative Process)

Project Officer to complete

4. Is this a Recovery Act award? ☒ Yes ☐ No

- If Yes, does the Buy American Act apply (see applicability below)? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- If Yes, does Davis Bacon Act apply (see applicability below)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If the answer to either the Buy American Act or Davis Bacon Act questions is Yes, provide a short discussion below on: 1) the type of entity; 2) what applies; Davis Bacon, Buy American, or both; 3) whether it applies to the prime, subrecipient, or both; and 4) work to be performed that requires applicability of Buy American and/or Davis Bacon.

Buy American Applicability for Recovery Act Awards: *If the applicant's project involves construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a* ***public building or public work of a governmental entity*** *then the Recovery Act's Buy American requirements apply (to the prime and/or the Subrecipient). If not, then those requirements are inapplicable. The implementing regulations define public building and public work to mean a public building of, and a public work of, a governmental entity including the United States; the District of Columbia; commonwealths, territories, and minor outlaying islands of the United States; State and local governments; and multi-State, regional, or interstate entities which have governmental functions. The public building or public work must be located in the United States. See 2 CFR § 176.140. The implementing regulations may be found at the following link: http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2009/pdf/E9-9073.pdf*

Davis Bacon Applicability for Recovery Act Awards: *If the applicant's project involves any resultant contracts that are in excess of $2,000 for construction, alteration or repair (including painting and decorating), then the Recovery Act's Davis Bacon requirements apply. The Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA) requires all contractors and subcontractors performing work on federal contracts in excess of $2,000 to pay their laborers and mechanics not less than the prevailing wage rates and fringe benefits for corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on similar projects in the area. The prevailing wage rates and fringe benefits are determined by the Secretary of Labor for inclusion in covered contracts.*

Complete this section for each subrecipient with proposed total costs of $100,000 or more. Otherwise, delete this section.

***For awards to corporations and nonprofits**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $250,000 or greater than or equal to 50% of the total project costs, whichever is less. **For awards to Universities, States, and Local Governments**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $500,000 or greater than or equal to 25% of the total project costs, whichever is less.*

*Full reviews consist of Tech Evaluation/Negotiation Memos covering reviews of budgets, budget justifications, and scopes of work. **For all sub-recipients costs that are below these thresholds, projects must continue to be assessed for reasonableness on the basis of the explanation (cost and brief description of work) presented by the Recipient in their application.***

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Subrecipient: _____

SECTION II – NEGOTIATION SUMMARY

Project Officer/Specialist to complete:

1. Please record any significant application or budget submissions that resulted in a revised budget in the Negotiation History Table below (including SF424A, budget justifications, e-mails, etc.):

Application/Budget Submission	Reference Document	Date of Submission	Summary of Change
Original			
Revision 1		REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	
Revision 2			
Revision "n"			

2. Complete Budget Table below (only include the original budget and final negotiated costs – the Percent of Total Negotiated Budget will calculate automatically)
Note: List proposed amounts by category even if there are no differences in the dollar amount.

Element of Cost	Original Budget Submission	Final Negotiated Costs	Percent of Total Negotiated Budget	Fringe Benefits and Indirects	
				Proposed Rate	Negotiated Rate
Personnel Fringe Benefits Travel Equipment Supplies Contractual Construction Other		REDACTED EXEMPTION 4			
Total Direct Charges Indirect Charges					
TOTAL					
Program Income					
DOE Share (non-FFRDC) DOE Share (FFRDC) Total DOE Share					
Non-Federal Cost Share					

SEE ATTACHED SF 424A FOR BUDGET PERIOD BREAKDOWN

3. Is the original budget the same as the negotiated budget: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If No, please check all boxes that apply:

- ☐ Change in the Project Scope
- ☐ Changes due to Time Delays
- ☐ Math Errors in Budget
- ☐ Changes in Indirect/Fringe Costs Caused Changes in Direct Costs or Total Project Costs
- ☐ Indirect/Fringe Rates incorrectly applied
- ☐ Other (explain) _____

4. Briefly describe and explain any substantial change(s) to the original Statement of Project Objectives submitted by the recipient:

Project Officer commentary:
N/A

SECTION III – TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

A. For each cost category, the Project Officer and the Specialist will complete his/her Technical Evaluation of the Negotiated Costs to confirm that they are all reasonable, allowable, and allocable. Additional comments should be added as necessary and as indicated below.

1. Personnel: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

Total Negotiated Personnel Costs:	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Personnel costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The labor hours proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒

The labor mix proposed in the negotiated budget is reasonable: ☒

Specialist:

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Labor Type	Budget Period 1			Budget Period 2		
	Hours	Rate	Total	Hours	Rate	Total

REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

Negotiated labor rates are reasonable: ☐ (Please attach supporting documentation e.g. www.salary.com, if applicable)

2. Fringe Benefits:

REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

Total Negotiated Fringe Benefit Costs:	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Fringe Benefit costs: ☐

Specialist:

Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____

Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____

If No, select one of the following:

☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

List Date of review: _____

☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable

☐ Other: _____

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

	Personnel	Total Cost	Fringe Rate	Cost
Example Only	*Principal Investigator*	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:				

The fringe benefit costs in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

3. Travel:

Total Negotiated Travel Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Travel costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The number and type of trips proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The costs per trip proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is foreign travel included in the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs below)

Location	Total Cost	Rationale for Foreign Travel

If the negotiated travel budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

4. Equipment:

Total Negotiated Equipment Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Equipment costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The type(s) of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget is/are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The cost of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is there any proposed equipment with a total cost exceeding $50,000: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs and basis of cost, i.e. historical price or vendor quote)

Equipment	Total Cost	Purpose of Equipment	Basis of Cost

If the negotiated equipment budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

5. Supplies:

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Total Negotiated Supplies Costs:	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Supplies costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The types /quantities of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable based on the scope of work: ☒

The costs of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☒

If the negotiated supply budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

6. Contractual:

Total Negotiated Contractual Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Contractual costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The subrecipients proposed in the negotiated budget are appropriate for the scope of work: ☐

The contractual costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐ Yes

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Subrecipient/Vendor Name	BP 1 Cost	BP 2 Cost	Total Cost	Contribution to Project (Identify SOPO Tasks)

Did the Recipient propose any subrecipients with total costs above $100,000? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, a separate Technical Evaluation/Negotiation Memorandum is required for each subrecipient/vendor – see below)

☐ Specialist concurs.

7. Construction:

Total Negotiated Construction Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Construction costs: ☒
Project Officer: The type of construction proposed in the negotiated budget is appropriate for the scope of work: ☐ The construction costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

8. Other Direct Costs:

Total Negotiated Other Direct Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Other Direct costs: ☒
Project Officer: The types of other direct costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ The costs proposed in the negotiated budget for other direct costs are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ *If the negotiated other direct cost budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:*	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

9. Indirect Charges:

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs:	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Indirect costs: ☐
Specialist: Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____ Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____ If No, select one of the following: ☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) ☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) List Date of review: _____ ☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable ☐ Other: _____ Please fill out the following tables with the negotiated costs:	

Base Item	Base Cost	Rate	Indirect Cost
Example Only: Modified Total Direct Costs	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:			

The indirect costs proposed in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Subrecipient:

DE-EE0002877

Complete this section for each subrecipient with proposed total costs of $100,000 or more. Otherwise, delete this section.

***For awards to corporations and nonprofits**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $250,000 or greater than or equal to 50% of the total project costs, whichever is less. **For awards to Universities, States, and Local Governments**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $500,000 or greater than or equal to 25% of the total project costs, whichever is less.*

*Full reviews consist of Tech Evaluation/Negotiation Memos covering reviews of budgets, budget justifications, and scopes of work. **For all sub-recipients costs that are below these thresholds, projects must continue to be assessed for reasonableness on the basis of the explanation (cost and brief description of work) presented by the Recipient in their application.***

Subrecipient: _____

SECTION II – NEGOTIATION SUMMARY

Project Officer/Specialist to complete:

3. Please record any significant application or budget submissions that resulted in a revised budget in the Negotiation History Table below (including SF424A, budget justifications, e-mails, etc.):

Application/Budget Submission	Reference Document	Date of Submission	Summary of Change
Original	PMC 123.1	7/8/2009	
Revision 1	REDACTED EXEMPTION 4		
Revision 2			
Revision "n"			

4. Complete Budget Table below (only include the original budget and final negotiated costs – the Percent of Total Negotiated Budget will calculate automatically)
Note: List proposed amounts by category even if there are no differences in the dollar amount.

Element of Cost	Original Budget Submission	Final Negotiated Costs	Percent of Total Negotiated Budget	Fringe Benefits and Indirects	
				Proposed Rate	Negotiated Rate
Personnel Fringe Benefits Travel Equipment Supplies Contractual Construction Other		REDACTED EXEMPTION 4			
Total Direct Charges Indirect Charges					
TOTAL					
Program Income					
DOE Share (non-FFRDC) DOE Share (FFRDC) Total DOE Share					
Non-Federal Cost Share					

SEE ATTACHED SF 424A FOR BUDGET PERIOD BREAKDOWN

3. Is the original budget the same as the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please check all boxes that apply:

☐ Change in the Project Scope
☐ Changes due to Time Delays
☐ Math Errors in Budget
☐ Changes in Indirect/Fringe Costs Caused Changes in Direct Costs or Total Project Costs
☐ Indirect/Fringe Rates incorrectly applied
☐ Other (explain) _____

5. Briefly describe and explain any substantial change(s) to the original Statement of Project Objectives submitted by the recipient:

Project Officer commentary:
Statement of Project Objectives was not provided in original application.

SECTION III – TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

A. For each cost category, the Project Officer and the Specialist will complete his/her Technical Evaluation of the Negotiated Costs to confirm that they are all reasonable, allowable, and allocable. Additional comments should be added as necessary and as indicated below.

1. Personnel:

Total Negotiated Personnel Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Personnel costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The labor hours proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The labor mix proposed in the negotiated budget is reasonable: ☐

Specialist:

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Labor Type	Budget Period 1			Budget Period 2		
	Hours	Rate	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
Total:	0		0	0		0

Negotiated labor rates are reasonable: ☐ (Please attach supporting documentation e.g. www.salary.com, if applicable)

2. Fringe Benefits:

Total Negotiated Fringe Benefit Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Fringe Benefit costs: ☐

Specialist:
Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____
Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____

If No, select one of the following:
☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)
List Date of review: _____

☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable

☐ Other: _____

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

	Personnel	Total Cost	Fringe Rate	Cost
Example Only	*Principal Investigator*	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:				

The fringe benefit costs in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

3. Travel:

Total Negotiated Travel Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Travel costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The number and type of trips proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The costs per trip proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is foreign travel included in the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs below)

Location	Total Cost	Rationale for Foreign Travel

If the negotiated travel budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

4. Equipment:

Total Negotiated Equipment Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Equipment costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The type(s) of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget is/are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The cost of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is there any proposed equipment with a total cost exceeding $50,000: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs and basis of cost, i.e. historical price or vendor quote)

Equipment	Total Cost	Purpose of Equipment	Basis of Cost

If the negotiated equipment budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

5. Supplies:

Total Negotiated Supplies Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Supplies costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The types /quantities of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable based on the scope of work: ☐

The costs of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

If the negotiated supply budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

6. Contractual:

Total Negotiated Contractual Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Contractual costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The subrecipients proposed in the negotiated budget are appropriate for the scope of work: ☐

The contractual costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐ Yes

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Subrecipient/Vendor Name	BP 1 Cost	BP 2 Cost	Total Cost	Contribution to Project (Identify SOPO Tasks)

Did the Recipient propose any subrecipients with total costs above $100,000? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, a separate Technical Evaluation/Negotiation Memorandum is required for each subrecipient/vendor – see below)

☐ Specialist concurs.

7. Construction:

Total Negotiated Construction Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Construction costs: ☐
Project Officer: The type of construction proposed in the negotiated budget is appropriate for the scope of work: ☐ The construction costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

8. Other Direct Costs:

Total Negotiated Other Direct Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Other Direct costs: ☐
Project Officer: The types of other direct costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ The costs proposed in the negotiated budget for other direct costs are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ *If the negotiated other direct cost budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:*	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

9. Indirect Charges:

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs: $ Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose indirect costs: ☐

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Indirect costs: ☐
Specialist: Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____ Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____ If No, select one of the following: ☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) ☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) List Date of review: _____ ☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable ☐ Other: _____ Please fill out the following tables with the negotiated costs:	

Base Item	Base Cost	Rate	Indirect Cost
Example Only: Modified Total Direct Costs	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:			

The indirect costs proposed in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

Subrecipient: _ REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

Complete this section for each subrecipient with proposed total costs of $100,000 or more. Otherwise, delete this section.

***For awards to corporations and nonprofits**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $250,000 or greater than or equal to 50% of the total project costs, whichever is less. **For awards to Universities, States, and Local Governments**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $500,000 or greater than or equal to 25% of the total project costs, whichever is less.*

*Full reviews consist of Tech Evaluation/Negotiation Memos covering reviews of budgets, budget justifications, and scopes of work. **For all sub-recipients costs that are below these thresholds, projects must continue to be assessed for reasonableness on the basis of the explanation (cost and brief description of work) presented by the Recipient in their application.***

Subrecipient: _ REDACTED EXEMPTION 4 _____

SECTION II – NEGOTIATION SUMMARY

Project Officer/Specialist to complete:

5. Please record any significant application or budget submissions that resulted in a revised budget in the Negotiation History Table below (including SF424A, budget justifications, e-mails, etc.):

Application/Budget Submission	Reference Document	Date of Submission	Summary of Change
Original	SF-424a; PMC 123.1	12/29/2009; 7/8/2009	
Revision 1			
Revision 2			
Revision "n"			

6. Complete Budget Table below (only include the original budget and final negotiated costs – the Percent of Total Negotiated Budget will calculate automatically)
Note: List proposed amounts by category even if there are no differences in the dollar amount.

Element of Cost	Original Budget Submission	Final Negotiated Costs	Percent of Total Negotiated Budget	Fringe Benefits and Indirects	
				Proposed Rate	Negotiated Rate
Personnel Fringe Benefits Travel Equipment Supplies Contractual Construction Other		REDACTED EXEMPTION 4			
Total Direct Charges Indirect Charges					
TOTAL					
Program Income					
DOE Share (non-FFRDC) DOE Share (FFRDC) Total DOE Share					
Non-Federal Cost Share					

SEE ATTACHED SF 424A FOR BUDGET PERIOD BREAKDOWN

3. Is the original budget the same as the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please check all boxes that apply:

☐ Change in the Project Scope
☐ Changes due to Time Delays
☐ Math Errors in Budget
☐ Changes in Indirect/Fringe Costs Caused Changes in Direct Costs or Total Project Costs
☐ Indirect/Fringe Rates incorrectly applied
☐ Other (explain) _____

6. Briefly describe and explain any substantial change(s) to the original Statement of Project Objectives submitted by the recipient:

Project Officer commentary:
Statement of Project Objectives was not provided in original application.

SECTION III – TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

A. For each cost category, the Project Officer and the Specialist will complete his/her Technical Evaluation of the Negotiated Costs to confirm that they are all reasonable, allowable, and allocable. Additional comments should be added as necessary and as indicated below.

1. Personnel:

Total Negotiated Personnel Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Personnel costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The labor hours proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒

The labor mix proposed in the negotiated budget is reasonable: ☒

Specialist:

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Labor Type	Budget Period 1			Budget Period 2		
	Hours	Rate	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
				REDACTED EXEMPTION 4		
Total:						

Negotiated labor rates are reasonable: ☐ (Please attach supporting documentation e.g. www.salary.com, if applicable)

2. Fringe Benefits:

Total Negotiated Fringe Benefit Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Fringe Benefit costs: ☐

Specialist:

Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____

Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____

If No, select one of the following:

☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

List Date of review: _____

☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable

☐ Other: _____

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

	Personnel	Total Cost	Fringe Rate	Cost
Example Only	*Principal Investigator*	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:				

The fringe benefit costs in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

3. Travel:

Total Negotiated Travel Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Travel costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The number and type of trips proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The costs per trip proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is foreign travel included in the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs below)

Location	Total Cost	Rationale for Foreign Travel

If the negotiated travel budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

4. Equipment:

Total Negotiated Equipment Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Equipment costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The type(s) of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget is/are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The cost of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is there any proposed equipment with a total cost exceeding $50,000: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs and basis of cost, i.e. historical price or vendor quote)

Equipment	Total Cost	Purpose of Equipment	Basis of Cost

If the negotiated equipment budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

5. Supplies:

Total Negotiated Supplies Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4 Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Supplies costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The types /quantities of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable based on the scope of work: ☐

The costs of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

If the negotiated supply budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

REDACTED EXEMPTION 4

☐ Specialist concurs.

Comment [CL5]:

REDACTED EXEMPTION 5 (Deliberative Process)

6. Contractual:

Total Negotiated Contractual Costs: $ | Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Contractual costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The subrecipients proposed in the negotiated budget are appropriate for the scope of work: ☐

The contractual costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐ Yes

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Subrecipient/Vendor Name	BP 1 Cost	BP 2 Cost	Total Cost	Contribution to Project (Identify SOPO Tasks)

Did the Recipient propose any subrecipients with total costs above $100,000? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, a separate Technical Evaluation/Negotiation Memorandum is required for each subrecipient/vendor – see below)

☐ Specialist concurs.

7. Construction:

Total Negotiated Construction Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Construction costs: ☐
Project Officer: The type of construction proposed in the negotiated budget is appropriate for the scope of work: ☒ The construction costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☒	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

8. Other Direct Costs:

Total Negotiated Other Direct Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Other Direct costs: ☐
Project Officer: The types of other direct costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ The costs proposed in the negotiated budget for other direct costs are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐ *If the negotiated other direct cost budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget. please explain the costs and rationale below:*	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

Comment [CL6]:

REDACTED EXEMPTION 5 (Deliberative Process)

9. Indirect Charges:

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Indirect costs: ☐
Specialist: Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____ Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____ If No, select one of the following: ☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) ☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) List Date of review: _____ ☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable ☐ Other: _____ Please fill out the following tables with the negotiated costs:	

Base Item	Base Cost	Rate	Indirect Cost
Example Only: Modified Total Direct Costs	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:			

The indirect costs proposed in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

REDACTED
EXEMPTION 4

Subrecipient: _

DE-EE0002877

Complete this section for each subrecipient with proposed total costs of $100,000 or more. Otherwise, delete this section.

***For awards to corporations and nonprofits**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $250,000 or greater than or equal to 50% of the total project costs, whichever is less. **For awards to Universities, States, and Local Governments**, full reviews of their individual sub-recipients will be conducted for sub-recipient work with total costs (including cost share) greater than or equal to $500,000 or greater than or equal to 25% of the total project costs, whichever is less.*

*Full reviews consist of Tech Evaluation/Negotiation Memos covering reviews of budgets, budget justifications, and scopes of work. **For all sub-recipients costs that are below these thresholds, projects must continue to be assessed for reasonableness on the basis of the explanation (cost and brief description of work) presented by the Recipient in their application.***

Subrecipient: _____

SECTION II – NEGOTIATION SUMMARY

Project Officer/Specialist to complete:

7. Please record any significant application or budget submissions that resulted in a revised budget in the Negotiation History Table below (including SF424A, budget justifications, e-mails, etc.):

Application/Budget Submission	Reference Document	Date of Submission	Summary of Change
Original		12/29/2009; 7/8/2009	
Revision 1	REDACTED		
Revision 2	EXEMPTION 4		
Revision "n"			

8. Complete Budget Table below (only include the original budget and final negotiated costs – the Percent of Total Negotiated Budget will calculate automatically)
Note: List proposed amounts by category even if there are no differences in the dollar amount.

Element of Cost	Original Budget Submission	Final Negotiated Costs	Percent of Total Negotiated Budget	Fringe Benefits and Indirects	
				Proposed Rate	Negotiated Rate
Personnel Fringe Benefits Travel Equipment Supplies Contractual Construction Other	REDACTED EXEMPTION 4				
Total Direct Charges Indirect Charges					
TOTAL					
Program Income					
DOE Share (non-FFRDC) DOE Share (FFRDC) Total DOE Share					
Non-Federal Cost Share					

SEE ATTACHED SF 424A FOR BUDGET PERIOD BREAKDOWN

3. Is the original budget the same as the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If No, please check all boxes that apply:

☐ Change in the Project Scope
☐ Changes due to Time Delays
☐ Math Errors in Budget
☐ Changes in Indirect/Fringe Costs Caused Changes in Direct Costs or Total Project Costs
☐ Indirect/Fringe Rates incorrectly applied
☐ Other (explain) _____

7. Briefly describe and explain any substantial change(s) to the original Statement of Project Objectives submitted by the recipient:

Project Officer commentary:
Statement of Project Objectives was not provided in original application.

SECTION III – TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

A. For each cost category, the Project Officer and the Specialist will complete his/her Technical Evaluation of the Negotiated Costs to confirm that they are all reasonable, allowable, and allocable. Additional comments should be added as necessary and as indicated below.

1. Personnel:

Total Negotiated Personnel Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Personnel costs: ☐

Project Officer:

The labor hours proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒

The labor mix proposed in the negotiated budget is reasonable: ☒

Specialist:

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Labor Type	Budget Period 1			Budget Period 2		
	Hours	Rate	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
			REDACTED EXEMPTION 4			
Total:						

Negotiated labor rates are reasonable: ☐ (Please attach supporting documentation e.g. www.salary.com, if applicable)

2. Fringe Benefits:

Total Negotiated Fringe Benefit Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Fringe Benefit costs: ☐

Specialist:
Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____
Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____

If No, select one of the following:
☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)

☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination)
List Date of review: _____

☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable

☐ Other: _____

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

	Personnel	Total Cost	Fringe Rate	Cost
Example Only	*Principal Investigator*	*$100,000*	*25%*	*$25,000*
Total:				

The fringe benefit costs in the negotiated budget were appropriately applied and are reasonable: ☐

3. Travel:

Total Negotiated Travel Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Travel costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The number and type of trips proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The costs per trip proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is foreign travel included in the negotiated budget: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs below)

Location	Total Cost	Rationale for Foreign Travel

If the negotiated travel budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

4. Equipment:

Total Negotiated Equipment Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Equipment costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The type(s) of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget is/are reasonable for the scope of work: ☐

The cost of equipment proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

Is there any proposed equipment with a total cost exceeding $50,000: ☐ Yes ☐ No (If yes, please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs and basis of cost, i.e. historical price or vendor quote)

Equipment	Total Cost	Purpose of Equipment	Basis of Cost

If the negotiated equipment budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

5. Supplies:

Total Negotiated Supplies Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Supplies costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The types /quantities of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable based on the scope of work: ☐

The costs of supplies proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐

If the negotiated supply budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget, please explain the costs and rationale below:

☐ Specialist concurs.

6. Contractual:

Total Negotiated Contractual Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Contractual costs: ☒

Project Officer:

The subrecipients proposed in the negotiated budget are appropriate for the scope of work: ☐

The contractual costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐ Yes

Please fill out the following table with the negotiated costs:

Subrecipient/Vendor Name	BP 1 Cost	BP 2 Cost	Total Cost	Contribution to Project (Identify SOPO Tasks)

Did the Recipient propose any subrecipients with total costs above $100,000? ☐ Yes ☐ No (If Yes, a separate Technical Evaluation/Negotiation Memorandum is required for each subrecipient/vendor – see below)

☐ Specialist concurs.

7. Construction:

Total Negotiated Construction Costs: $	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Construction costs: ☒
Project Officer: The type of construction proposed in the negotiated budget is appropriate for the scope of work: ☐ The construction costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable: ☐	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

8. Other Direct Costs:

Total Negotiated Other Direct Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Other Direct costs: ☐
Project Officer: The types of other direct costs proposed in the negotiated budget are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒ The costs proposed in the negotiated budget for other direct costs are reasonable for the scope of work: ☒ *If the negotiated other direct cost budget is greater than $100,000 or greater than 15% of the total negotiated budget. please explain the costs and rationale below:* REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	
☐ Specialist concurs.	

9. Indirect Charges:

Total Negotiated Indirect Costs: REDACTED EXEMPTION 4	Not Applicable, the recipient did not propose Indirect costs: ☐
Specialist: Does the Recipient have an approved rate agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, List the Date of Rate Agreement: _____ Cite Federal Cognizant Agency: _____ If No, select one of the following: ☐ Rate proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst and found to be reasonable, allowable, and allocable (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) ☐ Rate Proposal was reviewed by the Cost/Price Analyst for a previous award (attach Cost/Price Analyst Determination) List Date of review: _____ ☐ Specialist determined that rate was reasonable ☐ Other: _____ Please fill out the following tables with the negotiated costs:	