

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****National Institute of Standards and Technology****Announcement of Two Public Workshops Regarding Conformity Assessment Bodies for the EMC/Telecom Annexes of the US/EC Mutual Recognition Agreement and Telecommunication Certification Bodies for the Federal Communication Commission**

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) invites interested parties to attend two half-day workshops regarding conformity assessment bodies for the EMC/Telecom Annexes of the US/EC Mutual Recognition Agreement and Telecommunication Certification Bodies for the Federal Communication Commission. The first half day workshop will be for the development of requirements for a sub-program under the National Voluntary Conformity Assessment System Evaluation (NVCASE) Program, which will satisfy the product testing and quality system registration requirements of the EMC/Telecom Annexes of the United States/European Commission Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA).

The second half-day workshop will be devoted to the development of requirements for another sub-program for Telecommunication Certification Bodies (TCBs) under NVCASE program. This sub-program will satisfy the product testing and quality system registration requirements of the Federal Communication Commission.

NVCASE procedures require NIST to consult the public when establishing requirements to be applied in evaluations conducted within the scope of NVCASE programs. NIST, Federal Communication Commission (FCC) and European Commission (EC) personnel will participate in these workshops. There is no fee for the workshops; however, all attendees must register in advance with the EMC/Telecom/TCBs Workshop Coordinator no later than April 16, 1999.

**DATES:** The workshop for the EMC/Telcom Annexes will be held on April 28, 1999, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. The workshop for the Telecommunication Certification Bodies will be held from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on April 28, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Both workshops will be held at Department of Commerce

Auditorium, Herbert C. Hoover Building, located at 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** For further information, you may telephone (301) 975-5120. You may register for one or both workshops by E-mail at scp@nist.gov or by fax at (301) 975-5414. You may also register by U.S. mail addressed to EMC/Telecom/TCBs Workshop Coordinator, NIST, 100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2100, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2100.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with Title 15 Part 286.2(b) of the Code of Federal Regulations, NIST has established these programs pursuant to a written direction from another Federal Agency, the Federal Communication Commission (FCC). The FCC, in its GED Docket No. 98-68, designated NIST as the entity with primary responsibility for accrediting Telecommunications Certification Bodies under the NVCASE program. NIST may directly accredit TCBs or may, in consultation with the Commission, designate additional accreditation bodies who will, in turn, accredit TCBs. The Commission will identify for NIST, for example, the specific types of tests that need to be done for telecommunications equipment and the types of measurements that should be done to demonstrate compliance with their rules; the processes that TCBs will use to obtain current and correct interpretations of rules or test procedures; and, the consultative activities requiring TCB participation. The Commission will provide public notice of the methods that NST will use to accredit TCBs consistent with the qualification criteria adopted.

The NVCASE regulations found at 15 CFR Part 286 require NIST to consult the public when establishing requirements to be applied in evaluations conducted within the scope of NVCASE programs. These programs under NVCASE will allow U.S. bodies to satisfy the conformity assessment requirements of the EMC/Telecom annexes of the US/EC Mutual Recognition Agreement and will also allow TCBs to satisfy the conformity assessment requirements of FCC.

The NVCASE public workshops will follow the European Commission training workshop, which is to be held on April 27, 1999, for Conformity Assessment Bodies in which EC personnel will outline the requirements of the EMC/Telecom Annexes of the MRA. Both workshops will be held at the same location. The text of the US/

EC MRA for the EMC/Telecom sectoral annexes can be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.iep.doc.gov/mra/mra.htm>. NIST, FCC and EC personnel will participate in the EC training workshop.

Dated: March 15, 1999.

**Raymond G. Kammer,**  
Director.

[FR Doc. 99-6772 Filed 3-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Technology Administration**

[Docket No. 990122027-9027-01]

RIN 0692-ZA02

**Announcement of Availability of Funding for Competitions—Experimental Program To Stimulate Competitive Technology (EPSCoT)**

**AGENCY:** Office of Technology Policy, Technology Administration, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Technology Administration's Office of Technology Policy (OTP) announces the availability of funding for the following competition to be held in fiscal year 1999 under the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology (EPSCoT). The EPSCoT will support technology-based economic growth in eligible states by promoting partnerships between state and local governments, universities, community colleges, non-profit organizations and the private sector. This notice provides general information for the competition planned for fiscal year 1999.

**DATES:** Complete applications for the Fiscal Year 1999 EPSCoT grant program must be mailed or hand-carried to the address indicated below and *received* by the Technology Administration no later than 5:00 P.M. EST, May 14, 1999. Postmark date is not sufficient. Applications which have been provided to a delivery service will be accepted for review *if the applicant can document that the application was provided to the delivery service by May 13, 1999 with delivery to the address listed below guaranteed prior to the closing date and time*. Applications will not be accepted via facsimile machine transmission or electronic mail.

**ADDRESSES:** U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Technology Administration, Attn: EPSCoT Director, Anita Balachandra, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, HCHB Room 4418, Washington, DC 20230.

**Note:** Due to Departmental security policies, hand carried packages must be delivered to Rm 1874.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anita Balachandra, Director of the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology, Telephone: (202) 482-1320, Fax: (202) 219-8667, Email: [epscot@ta.doc.gov](mailto:epscot@ta.doc.gov).

Information on the EPSCoT is also available at: <http://www.ta.doc.gov/epscot>

For fax and email inquiries, please include a name, mailing address, and phone number.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Authority**

The statutory authority for the EPSCoT is the Technology Administration Act of 1998, codified at 15 U.S.C. 3704(f).

##### **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance**

The CFDA number is 11.614—Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology (EPSCoT)

##### **Program Description**

The Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology (EPSCoT) will support technology-based economic growth in eligible states by promoting partnerships among state and local governments, universities, community colleges, non-profit organizations and the private sector. Through these partnerships, EPSCoT seeks to support local efforts to:

- Build state-side institutional capacity to support technology commercialization
- Create the business climate that is conducive to technology development, deployment and diffusion

The EPSCoT will provide financial assistance in eligible states for activities that foster the growth of technology-oriented businesses.

The EPSCoT parallels the National Science Foundation's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). While EPSCoR's primary emphasis is improving the competitive performance of major research universities of these states, EPSCoT seeks to support state efforts to improve its commercial technology base.

##### **Funding Availability**

- In fiscal year 1999,
  - Approximately \$2 million is available
  - TA anticipates that between six and eight grants will be awarded
  - Funding for multiple year awards will be contingent on the *achievement of annual milestones*.

##### **Matching Funds Requirements**

Grant recipients under this program are required to provide matching funds toward the total project cost

- For single-state proposals, TA will provide up to 50% of the total project cost
- For multi-state proposals, TA will provide up to 75% of the total project cost
- Applicants must document the capacity to supply matching funds
- Matching funds may be in the form of cash
- In-kind match may not exceed 25% of the total project cost
- If an applicant incurs any project costs prior to the start date negotiated at the time the award is made, it does so solely at its own risk of not being reimbursed by the government and it will not be allowable as "match."
- Federal funds (such as grants) generally may not be used as matching funds, except as provided by federal statute. For information about whether particular federal funds may be used as matching funds, the applicant should contact the federal agency that administers the funds in question.
- Information on administrative requirements for financial assistance can be found in 15 CFR Part 14 and 15 CFR Part 24, as applicable. Applicable cost principles are the following: OMB Circular A-87 for State, local, or Federally-recognized Indian tribal governments, OMB Circular A-122 for non-profit organizations, OMB Circular A-21 for educational institutions, and the Federal Acquisition Regulations, 48 CFR Part 31 for commercial organizations.

##### **Type of Funding Instruments**

- The funding instruments for awards under this program shall be grants and cooperative agreements.

##### **Eligibility Criteria**

By law, the program is open to "those states that have historically received less Federal R&D funds than a majority of the states." (15 U.S.C. 3704(f)) Listed below are the states that ranked lower than 26th in the distribution of Federal Research and Development funds between 1990-1996.<sup>1</sup>

Eligible organizations shall be headquartered in one of the following states: Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina,

<sup>1</sup> The ranking is based on the *average* Federal R&D investment over the years 1990-96.

South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Within these states, state, local, or Indian tribal governments, community colleges, universities, non-profit organizations, private (for-profit) organizations, technology business centers, business incubators, industry councils or *any combination of these entities* may submit proposals.

- TA shall not award more than one EPSCoT grant per grant round within a single state<sup>2</sup>.

• Multi-state proposals do not count as projects submitted by an organization from a single state.

• Entities that are not headquartered in one of the eligible states, such as national or regional organizations or federal laboratories, may participate as partners, but may not serve as lead organizations.

• The lead organization is the organization to which funds will be disbursed—this is the organization that is listed in Box 5 of Standard Form 424.

##### **Award Period**

- Awards will be made for between 12 and 36 months
- Multiple year awards will be contingent on the *achievement of annual milestones*.

##### **Proposal Format**

###### **Application Forms**

A complete proposal will include the following *in the following order*:

- Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance
- Executive Summary (125 words)
- Project Narrative (no more than 10 pages)
- Task-Based Budget Narrative
- Statement of Matching Funds
- Optional: Appendices, Timeliness, Letters of support
- Standard Form 424A
- Standard Form 424B: Assurances
- Standard Form CD-511: Certificates
- Standard Form LLL: Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (*if applicable*)
- *Upon selection for an award*, applicants will be required to submit a Standard Form CD-346

*The total package may not exceed 30 pages, not including the standard forms.*

###### **Pagination**

The pages of an EPSCoT application should be numbered consecutively, starting with the first page of the Project

<sup>2</sup> The Technology Administration reserves the right to make an exception in the event that an organization submits a single state proposal and that state is implicated in a multi-state proposal and both are final candidates for awards.

Narrative. Applicants may insert a Table of Contents after the Standard Form 424 and before the Project Narrative to assist reviewers in locating information.

#### Page Formats

The proposal should be typed, single-spaced, on 8½" × 11" paper. All text should be prepared using a font of no less than 12 point with margins of no less than one inch (1").

#### Total Number of Copies

TA requests that each applicant submit one (1) original signed proposal and two (2) copies. The copy with original signatures should clearly be marked "Original." Each duplicate should be clearly marked "Copy." The copy marked "Original" must be clipped with a binder clip. The two copies must each be stapled.

#### Signatures

Signatures are required in the following places in the application

- Bottom (box 18d) of Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance
- Back page of Standard Form 424B, Assurances
- Bottom of back page of Standard Form CD-511, Certifications
- Bottom of Standard Form LLL, Disclosures of Lobbying Activities (*if applicable*)

Standard Forms 424, 424B, CD-511 and LLL should be signed by someone who is authorized to commit the applicant organization(s), such as the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, President, or Executive Director. Original signatures should be in blue ink so that the original proposal can be easily distinguished from the duplicate copies.

#### Page Limit

The total proposal must not exceed 30 pages, including a 125-word Executive Summary, 10-page Project Narrative, and Budget Narrative. The 30-page limit includes all text, tables, illustrations, maps, letters, references, résumés and supporting documents, and *excludes* the Standard Forms. Applicants are advised that appendices and Curriculum Vitae should be limited to professional experience that is *directly relevant to the proposed activity*.

#### Contact Information

Applicants must provide the following contact information on Standard Form 424:

- Legal name
- Complete mailing address
- Telephone number
- Fax number
- Name of a contact individual

- Electronic mail address, if any.
- If any of this contact information changes after the application is submitted, the applicant must immediately notify EPSCoT in writing.

#### Narrative Elements

Each proposal must address the following: It is recommended that the project narrative be organized in these five sections.

##### (1) Project Definition

- Describe the proposed activity and how it was identified.
- Describe how the proposed activity will address a specific problem.
- Describe the appropriate stakeholders and partners and how they are engaged in this process.

##### (2) Project Impact

- Explain why the proposed activity is a good investment of Federal funds.
- Describe how the proposed activity represents an innovation in technology-based economic development.
- Describe the expected impact of the proposed activity.
- Describe how the proposed activity will be completed within the grant life, or become self-sustaining afterward.
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity is new to the state; EPSCoT will not subsidize the operating costs of existing activities.

##### (3) Engagement With the Private Sector

- Describe the engagement of small high-tech businesses.
- Describe how the proposed activity will improve the state's capacity to support small high-technology businesses.
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity responds to the needs of small high-tech businesses.

##### (4) Coordination Within and/or Among States

- Describe how the proposed activity relates to, or builds upon, the strategic plans developed for economic development, science and technology and NSF EPSCoR.
- Describe how collaborators were identified.
- Describe how the proposed activity supports or furthers the collaborators' missions.

##### (5) Project Feasibility

- Describe the qualifications of personnel.
- Describe how the project will be managed.
- Describe how decisions will be made between and among partners.
- Describe how funds will be allocated, given the project timeline and

milestones. The budget should allow sufficient funds for evaluation, dissemination of results and participation in one meeting in Washington, DC.

- Demonstrate the ability to procure matching funds.
- Describe the quality of match: while in-kind contributions are allowable, preference will be given to those that are able to procure a cash match.
- Provide a task-based budget, relating project costs to specific tasks.

##### (6) Evaluation

- Describe the appropriate outcome-measures for the proposed activity
- Detail the timeline for the proposed activity, including specific milestones and tasks so that the benefits of the proposed activity are both measurable and severable.

#### Funding Priorities

EPSCoT is intended to strengthen the technological competitiveness of those states that have historically received less Federal R&D funds than a majority of the states. In order to have the greatest impact with limited funds, the program seeks to support the most innovative projects with the expectation that these projects will create new knowledge, develop successful institutional relationships, demonstrate new concepts that can be replicated, or develop concepts that can be sustained by other organizations at the end of the grant life. Similarly, applicants must demonstrate that they have made the maximum use of all available resources within the state.

Thus, EPSCoT's funding priorities are innovation and coordination within and/or among states. *EPSCoT funds are not intended for the construction of facilities, nor are they intended to subsidize an organization's operating costs.* EPSCoT is meant to assist states in their attempts to foster technology-based economic growth. A strategy for doing so should build on *local expertise and local resources*—those of the state government, research universities, community colleges, vocational schools, business community, finance community and any Federal resources the jurisdiction may have, such as national labs, manufacturing extension centers, or technology transfer centers. To this end, applicants must demonstrate that they are developing targeted and effective teaming arrangements among participating organizations.

The competition for EPSCoT awards is intense. Applications will undergo a

rigorous review and must be cost-share. They will be of a finite duration, ranging from 12 to 36 months. It is intended that EPSCoT projects will serve as models for other states.

#### *Innovative Value of Project*

Reviewers will be instructed to assess whether the proposed activity represents an innovation in technology-based economic development and whether the proposed activity is likely to improve the technological competitiveness of the state/region.

#### *Coordination Within the State*

Coordination within states is a principal priority of the EPSCoT. Multiple proposals from the same state will be scrutinized carefully, not only for redundancy, but also to determine whether the proposed activities will be carried out in isolation. Single proposals representing collaboration between stakeholders in a particular state will be reviewed more favorably.

*Applicants are required to demonstrate familiarity with the strategic plans developed by the state's EPSCoR Committee, economic development agency and/or science & technology council. The proposed activity should be related to the stated priorities of these plans.*

Applicants are required to specify whether they are applying for funds to improve the innovative capacity of the state, to facilitate cluster development within the state, or to undertake a planning activity. These designations are discussed below:

#### *Improving the Innovative Capacity*

Applicants may apply for EPSCoT funds in order to improve the state or region's innovative capacity.

Any such effort should begin with a solid analysis of the local economy and include an understanding of the industrial base, the existing network of services available to high-tech businesses and an assessment of any gaps in that network. A group of companies may seek to establish an entity that assists them to utilize existing resources more effectively or to provide a service that is currently not available. In either case, the objective should be to facilitate the growth of technology-oriented businesses.

#### *Facilitating Cluster Development*

The term "cluster" generally refers to a group of companies in related industries that are (1) geographically concentrated and (2) contributing to the wealth creation of the region in which they are concentrated. A state—or high technology council or other entity—may

conduct a comprehensive analysis of the region's industrial base for the purpose of identifying budding clusters. When no single industry cluster is large enough to sustain an exclusive effort, companies, university researchers and public agencies might work together to address a problem that faces a group of companies in the region. Such an effort might involve developing a strategy that ties together the state's industrial base, universities and community colleges so that there are more local employment opportunities for graduates in science and technology fields.

#### *Planning Grants*

Applicants may apply for planning grants. A planning activity involving the research community, economic development agencies, private sector, science & technology councils, community colleges, and/or vocational schools, could lay the groundwork for a larger initiative. Such an effort would ideally build on previous efforts and integrate the complementary but distinct missions of the participating organizations toward common goals.

#### *Multi-State Proposals*

Recognizing that a regional economy may not always fit within the boundaries of one state, the Technology Administration will consider proposals for multi-state projects. The requirement of matching funds is reduced for multi-state proposals. Applicants are expected to demonstrate the proposed activity's importance to the stated economic development priorities of the participating states. Multi-state proposals will not be considered against each state's total.

Any of the activities described above could be launched on a regional scale. A group of high-technology industry councils could collaborate to develop resources in support of an emerging industry cluster. Applicants representing a group of states could work together to identify industry clusters and develop strategies to support those clusters. For example, such an initiative could improve technology access for micro-enterprises by harmonizing the technology licensing practices among the universities in participating states. A group of states could also cooperate to link and leverage their efforts in a specific area in order to provide a more seamless regional infrastructure.

#### **Other Requirements**

Each successful applicant will be required to travel to Washington and participate in a 2-day networking meeting. The purpose of this meeting is

to brief the Technology Administration on the progress of the funded projects and to provide awardees with an opportunity to compare notes with one another.

In addition, awardees will be required to provide the Technology Administration with *quarterly* progress reports, consisting of a 1-2 page activity summary and a budget summary that relates to the project milestones. At the end of the grant period, a final project report is required before the final disbursement of funds. This report must explain the contribution of the funded activity to the state's competitiveness and measures of its success.

#### **Evaluation Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

##### *(1) Project Definition (10 points)*

Proposals will be evaluated on the clarity with which they

- Identify/define a specific problem or issue that the proposed activity is to address
- Identify stakeholders and partners
- Propose a solution—and specify the process for identifying this particular solution

##### *(2) Project Impact (30 points)*

Reviewers will be instructed to evaluate the degree to which the proposals:

- Explain why the proposed activity is a good investment of public funds.
- Demonstrate the greatest value per Federal dollar.
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity represents an *innovation* in technology-based economic development.
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity will have an *impact* on the state/region's industrial base.
- Address the needs of underserved areas.
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity will be completed within the grant life, or become self-sustaining afterward.

##### *(3) Engagement With the Small High-Tech Business Community (202 points)*

Proposals will be evaluated for the degree to which they:

- Demonstrate engagement of small high-tech businesses
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity does in fact increase the state/region's support of small high technology businesses
- Demonstrate that the proposed activity responds to the needs of small high tech businesses

**(4) Coordination Within and/or Among States (20 points)**

Proposals will be evaluated for the

- Degree to which they develop effective teaming arrangements between disparate organizations
- Degree to which the proposed activity builds upon the complementary missions of the partners
- Strength and diversity of support for the project within the state/region
- Partnerships involved—they must be clearly defined, mutually beneficial, and the commitments well documented
- Demonstrated understanding of the strategic plans developed by the state's EPSCoR committee, economic development agency and/or science and technology council. The proposed activity should relate to the stated priorities of these plans.

**(5) Project Feasibility (10 points)**

Proposals will be evaluated for the

- Adequacy of the personnel—their expertise and ability to carry out the proposed activity
- Capabilities of the applicant (lead) organization
- Clarity of the management plan, including the identification of partners and how decision-making responsibilities will be shared among he partners
- Clarity of the budget plan it should include a *task-based budget* that relates project costs to specific tasks and should be sufficiently detailed so that the relationship between budget items and milestones in the project narrative is clear
- Reasonableness of costs
- Demonstrated ability to provide or procure matching funds
- Quality of match: while in-kind contributions are allowable, preference will be given to those that are able to provide a cash match

**(6) Evaluation (10 points)**

Each proposal must include a plan for evaluating the project and a plan for disseminating knowledge gained from the project. The evaluation plan must identify specific, quantifiable measurable outcomes of the proposed activity. *Outcomes should reflect benefits that are measurable on an annual basis.* The evaluation plan should include both quantitative and qualitative indicators and must identify specific evaluation methods. The evaluation plan should also capture the lessons learned during the project that will serve as pragmatic tips for others interested in replicating or adapting the project in other regions. Applications must include the qualifications of any

proposed evaluators and sufficient funds in the budget to perform a thorough and useful evaluation of the project.

Finally, applicants must demonstrate a willingness to share information about their projects with interested parties, to host site visits, and to participate in demonstrations.

**Selection Procedures**

Each eligible application will first be reviewed by outside reviewers. Each reviewer will evaluate applications according to the *evaluation criteria* above. Each reviewer will make non-binding recommendations to a committee of Federal officials, chaired by the EPSCoT Director. This committee will prepare and present a set of recommended grant awards to the Selecting Official, the Under Secretary for Technology. The Committee's recommendations and the Under Secretary's review and approval will take into account the following:

- The evaluations of the outside reviewers,
- The evaluation criteria listed above,
- The degree to which the slate of applications, taken as a whole, satisfies the program's stated purposes,
- The variety of the proposed activities,
- The availability of funds,
- The geographic distribution of the proposed grant awards, and
- The avoidance of redundancy and conflicts with the initiatives of other federal agencies

**Intergovernmental Review**

Applicants under this program are subject to Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs."

**Additional Requirements****Federal Policies and Procedures**

Recipients and subrecipients under the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Technology (EPSCoT) shall be subject to all Federal laws and Federal and Departmental regulations, policies, and procedures applicable to financial assistance awards.

**Past Performance**

Unsatisfactory performance under prior Federal awards may result in an application not being considered for funding.

**Preaward Activities**

Applicants (or their institutions) who incur any costs prior to the beginning of an award period do so solely at their own risk of not being reimbursed by the Government. Notwithstanding any

verbal assurance that may have been provided, there is no obligation on the part of TA to cover pre-award costs.

**No Obligation for Future Funding**

If an application is accepted for funding, TA has no obligation to provide any additional future funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of TA.

**Delinquent Federal Debts**

No award of Federal funds shall be made to an applicant who has an outstanding delinquent Federal debt until either:

- (1) The delinquent account is paid in full,
- (2) A negotiated repayment schedule is established and at least one payment is received, or
- (3) Other arrangements satisfactory to DoC are made.

**Name Check Reviews**

All for-profit and non-profit applicants will be subject to a name check review process. Name checks are intended to reveal if any individuals associated with the applicant have been convicted of or are presently facing, criminal charges such as fraud, theft, perjury, or other matters which significantly reflect on the applicant's management honesty or financial integrity.

**Primary Application Certifications**

All primary applicant institutions must submit a completed form CD-511, "Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying," and the following explanations must be provided:

(1) *Non-procurement Debarment and Suspension.* Prospective participants (as defined at 15 CFR Part 26, Section 105) are subject to 15 CFR Part 26, "Non-procurement Debarment and Suspension" and the related section of the certification form prescribed above applies;

(2) *Drug-Free Workplace.* Grantees (as defined at 15 CFR Part 26, Section 605) are subject to 15 CFR Part 26, Subpart F, "Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)" and the related section of the certification form prescribed above applies;

(3) *Anti-Lobbying.* Persons (as defined at 15 CFR Part 28, Section 105) are subject to the lobbying provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1352, "Limitation on use of appropriated funds to influence certain Federal contracting and financial

transactions," and the lobbying section of the certification form prescribed above applies to applications/bids for grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for more than \$100,000, and loans and loan guarantees for more than \$150,000, or the single family maximum mortgage limit for affected programs, whichever is greater.

(4) *Anti-Lobbying Disclosure.* Any applicant institution that has paid or will pay for lobbying using any funds must submit an SF-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," as required under 15 CFR Part 28, Appendix B.

(5) *Lower-Tier Certifications.* Recipients shall require applicant/bidder institutions for subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, or other lower tier covered transactions at any tier under the award to submit, if applicable, a completed Form CD-512, "Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transactions and Lobbying" and disclosure form, SF-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities." Form CD-512, is intended for the use of recipients and should not be transmitted to TA. SF-LLL submitted by any tier recipient or subrecipient should be submitted to TA in accordance with the instructions contained in the award document.

#### *False Statements*

A false statement on an application is grounds for denial or termination of funds, and grounds for possible punishment by a fine or imprisonment as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

#### *Waiver Authority*

It is the general intent of TA not to waive any of the provisions set forth in this Notice. However, under extraordinary circumstances and when it is in the best interests of the federal government, TA, upon its own initiative or when requested, may waive the provisions in this Notice. Waivers may only be granted for requirements that are discretionary and not mandated by statute. Any request for a waiver must set forth the extraordinary circumstances for the request and be included in the application or sent to the address provided in the ADDRESSES section above. The final determination will be made by the Selecting Official, the Under Secretary for Technology. TA will not consider a request to waive the application deadline for an application until the application has been received. In the event that this authority is exercised, the Under Secretary will sign a memorandum for the file setting forth the justification for the waiver.

#### *Indirect Costs*

No Federal funds will be authorized for Indirect Costs (IDC); however, an applicant may provide for IDC under their portion of Cost Sharing.

Regardless of any approved indirect cost rate applicable to the award, the maximum dollar amount of allocable indirect costs for which the DoC will reimburse the Recipient shall be the lesser of:

(a) The Federal share of the total allocable indirect costs of the award based on the negotiated rate with the cognizant Federal Agency as established by audit or negotiation; or

(b) The line item amount for the Federal share of indirect costs contained in the approved budget of the award.

#### *Freedom of Information Act*

Because of the high level of public interest in projects supported by the EPSCoT, the program anticipates receiving requests for copies of successful applications. Applicants are hereby notified that the applications they submit are subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Applicants may identify sensitive information and label it "confidential" to assist TA in making disclosure determinations.

#### *Purchase of American-Made Equipment and Products*

Applicants are hereby notified that they are encouraged, to the greatest practicable extent, to purchase American-made equipment and products with funding provided under this program.

#### *Paperwork Reduction Act*

This Notice involves collections of information subject to the paperwork Reduction act (PRA), which have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under OMB Control Numbers 0348-0043, 0348-0044, 0348-0040 and 0348-0046. Notwithstanding any other provision of law no person is required to respond to nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the PRA unless that collection displays a current valid OMB control number.

#### *Executive Order Statement*

This funding notice was determined to be "not significant" for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

**Gary R. Bachula,**

*Acting Under Secretary for Technology.*

[FR Doc. 99-6719 Filed 3-18-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-18-M

## COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

### Increase of a Guaranteed Access Level for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the Dominican Republic

March 12, 1999.

**AGENCY:** Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

**ACTION:** Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs increasing a guaranteed access level.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 23, 1999.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Naomi Freeman, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of this limit, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port, call (202) 927-5850, or refer to the U.S. Customs website at <http://www.customs.ustreas.gov>. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482-3715.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Authority:** Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

Upon a request from the Government of the Dominican Republic, the U.S. Government has agreed to increase the current Guaranteed Access Level for Categories 338/638 to 3,150,000 dozen.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 63 FR 71096, published on December 23, 1998). Also see 63 FR 63297, published on November 12, 1998.

**J. Hayden Boyd,**

*Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

**Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements**

March 12, 1999.

Commissioner of Customs,  
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on November 5, 1998, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in the Dominican Republic