**DE-FOA-0003105**
**Questions and Answers**
**Amendment 00010**
[Note some questions have pending responses that will be provided in an upcoming amendment]

| Number | Question | Answer |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Since FFRDCs cannot lobby are they required to submit an SF-LLL? | No, it is not required for FFRDCs. |
| 2 | Since FFRDCs will be funded through a field work proposal process is a budget justification required? | Yes, in addition to DOE Work Proposal for FFRDCs, if applicable (see DOE O 412.1A, FOA Attachment 2) for DOE and NNSA FFRDCs. |
| 3 | Are letters of commitment required for FFRDCs? | For DOE or NNSA FFRDCs - A letter from the cognizant DOE/NNSA Contracting Officer shall provide a written authorization and this authorization shall be submitted with the application:<br>The following wording is acceptable for the authorization:<br><br>*Authorization is granted for the Laboratory to participate in the proposed project. The work proposed for the Laboratory is consistent with or complementary to the missions of the Laboratory and will not adversely impact execution of the DOE assigned programs at the Laboratory.*<br><br>Non-DOE/NNSA FFRDCs- The federal agency sponsoring the FFRDC must authorize in writing the use of the FFRDC on the proposed project and this authorization must be submitted with the application. The use of a FFRDC must be consistent with its authority under its award. |
| 4 | Under AOI 1 (CMM Supply Chain) can a responder apply to AOI 1B Phase II only thereby skipping Phase I as long as the technology has been demonstrated on a continuous bench scale basis? | Yes, an application can submit to AOI1B if they can demonstrate that they have successfully accomplished the bench scale and are ready to move forward to the pilot scale. |
| 5 | I am interested in developing technology specifically for better separation and processing. This is only one step of | In most of the AOI's we're looking for more than a single step development. The one exception to this is AOI 3 but it comes with a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | a complete process from feedstock to CMMs. It seems as if proposals to AOI 1A are expected to be for a complete process? Is this correct? | caveat. Under this AOI, we're not looking for marginal improvements to existing technologies. There have been in the past and may be future funding opportunities within DOE that focus on single step developments and/or marginal improvements to existing technologies. |
| 6 | Are rare earth element-free cathode materials for solid oxide electrolysis cells within the acceptable alternatives or substitutes within Area of Interest 4A? | Yes, if eliminating heavy REEs would be the focus of the effort. If only the more abundant La or Ce REEs are being eliminated, then a sound justification would have to be made in the application. |
| 7 | Can there be co-PIs? | Yes, but each PI will have to meet the expectations and requirements for PIs in the FOA. |
| 8 | What are the requirements for a PI as far as how they are employed by the company applying for the project?<br><br>Is there a minimum number of hours they need to work for the company?<br><br>Are there other requirements? | Pt. 1-There are no requirements but their status or role within the company shall not interfere or subjugated the PI's responsibilities as outlined in the FOA.<br><br>Pt. 2-No, but see answer to pt. 1.<br><br>Pt. 3-The FOA has several expectations and requirements of the PI, please review carefully. |
| 9 | Is there a minimum required percentage of work that the Prime Recipient must perform vs subrecipients? | There is no minimum requirement. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00001 Q&A** | | |
| 10 | Is there a minimum required percentage of work that the Prime Recipient must perform vs subrecipients? | There is no minimum requirement. |
| 11 | As our team is working on preparing a submission, we have noted that the FOA has discrepancies between the required document table, the technical volume detail sections, and the templates provided on the grants.gov workspace. The FOA instructions are similar to many elements typically required in EERE FOAs while the attachments in the grants.gov workspace are more like those typically required of FOAs from FECM. Some of the specific discrepancies and questions include 1) the FOA states that a control number will be assigned in the workspace, but was not. | There are two tracking numbers for each submission. A **Grants.gov number**, which is automatically assigned to every application *submission*.<br><br>And…<br><br>A **control number**. For the control number please use the Prime Recipient's UEI. If the Prime Recipient is submitting multiple applications, use the Prime Recipients UEI with the suffix .2, .3 .4 ect. For example:<br><br>Application 1: ABC123DEF456<br>Application 2: ABC123DEF456.2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Application 3: ABC123DEF456.3 |
| 12 | No SOPO template is provided to indicate the preferred format | A sample format will be provided in the FedConnect Announcement and Grants.gov. |
| 13 | Does the summary slide have a template? | There is no template. |
| 14 | A location of work template has not been provided | There is no template. |
| 15 | The SF424 is listed as a pdf file in the FOA table but is a webform on the grants.gov workspace; | Please see fillable forms here : SF-424 Family \| GRANTS.GOV |
| 16 **(Amendment 00004)** | Technology Maturation Plan is required in the FOA table but no details are provided in the text | See Response to 41 and amendment 0004. |
| 17 | Project Management Plan is listed as separate required document in the table but details are provided as part of the workplan section of the technical volume document | Please provide the Project Management Plan as a separate document. |
| 18 | Clarification on Cost-Share Exemption for Institutions of Higher Education: we are at an R1 university and if we request funding from 09/01/2024 to 08/31/2026, do we qualify for the cost sharing exemption available for the two-year period beginning on August 9, 2022? I am confused about the rules here. | Awards made to IHEs or Nonprofits during the 2-year extension are exempt from the cost share requirement in 2 CFR 910.130 for the period of performance of the award (base + any continuations included at time of award). |
| 19 **(Amendment 00003)** | If a waste product generating less than 10 metric tons of CM's per year would be considered under the FOA? | Yes. |
| 20 | Will the cost share waiver go through the entire project or will it end in July of 2024? | See answer 18 |
| 21 **(Amendment 00003)** | Are supercapacitors in scope for this FOA? | Yes. |
| 22 **(Amendment 00004)** | Can magnets can be proposed as part of AOI:5 for wind turbines (if we see this as one of the energy technologies) or are they completely excluded? | The magnets for wind turbines are outside of the scope of AOI:5. |
| 23 | Concerning the required control number referenced under IV. Application and Submission Information, A. Application Process, please note that Grants.gov Workspace generates a Workspace ID number, however, it does not appear that a control number is generated within the submission portal. Will a control number be determined by the agency independently and sent out via email to the point of contact for the application? | See answer 11 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 24<br>**(Amendment 00003)** | Please clarify the TRL requirements for AOI 4A and 4B. It is unclear the TRL range expectations for AOI 4A and 4B. | We are not specifying specific TRL for in AOI 4A, but AOI 4B should end with a TRL 6 (pilot scale) project. |
| 25<br>**(Amendment 00003)** | Please clarify if the TRL requirement is for the technology pre-grant, or the TRL anticipated after grant performance. | Projects should achieve specified TRLs by the end of the projects. See Appendix E. |
| 26<br>**(Amendment 00003)** | With respect to assessing the TRL, should the focus be on the TRL of the alternative material itself, or a specific application of that material, or the proposed substitution pathway(s). | The proposed substitute pathway. |
| 27<br>**(Amendment 00003)** | Finally, there is a dangling clause at the end of the section AOI 4: Alternative Materials, simply reading "TRL 6". Please clarify. | AOI 4B should end with a TRL 6 (pilot scale) project. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00002 Q&A** | | |
| 28 | We would like some clarification regarding the cost share requirement waiver on pages 17 and 18. As a FFRDC we have generally never been able to provide cost share – so the waiver does not seem to apply to us. The footnote (#19) on that page says that cost share is calculated based on the total cost of the project "…including FFRDC costs…" so there is no relief on the total cost share requirement. It would seem that the only change is that Universities may now be considered exempt from providing cost share – which has the effect of increasing the cost share burden on the industry partner(s). Is this the intent of this policy? | Cost-sharing is not required for basic and applied research activities awarded under this FOA performed by Institutions of higher education, nonprofit institutions (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)), or DOE/NNSA and Non-DOE FFRDCs National Laboratories. |
| 29 | Under AOI 1 (CMM Supply Chain), can we apply to both AOI 1A Phase I and AOI 1B Phase II? In another word, we need some additional work on Phase I, we would love to move on to Phase II afterword. Will that be two separated applications? | The plan for this funding opportunity is to advance the TRL of successful projects. It is expected for successful Phase I projects to an opportunity to move to Phase II. A project can not apply/move to Phase II unless it has been demonstrated on a continuous/semicontinuous basis on a bench scale. |
| 30 | DE-FOA-0003105 states on page 17/18:<br>"Cost sharing is not required for institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations. This waiver is granted per Section 10725 of the Research and Development, Competition, and | See response to question 18. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Innovation Act, P.L. 117-167, which extends the cost share waiver pilot program enacted by Section 108 of the Department of Energy Research and Innovation Act, Public Law 115–246 (Innovation Act) and provides an exemption for institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations from the 20% cost share requirement for R&D activities. The exemption is available for the two-year period beginning on August 9, 2022. Codified at 42 U.S.C. 16352."<br><br>Can you please clarify the significance of the two-year period: Does it mean cost share is not required if the performance period falls in the two year period, or the contracting to fund a project is completed within two years, or that the project proposal deadline falls within the two year timeline, or that another interpretation of the two year timeline is appropriate? | |
| 31 | Is IPMP regarded as part of the proposal submission. There is conflicting information.<br><br>"Applicants must submit an executed Intellectual Property Management Plan (IPMP) between the members of the consortia or project team." (Appl Info - IV,C,xix)<br><br>Full Application Content Requirements includes IPMP (Appl Info - IV,C,i)<br><br>"Within 30 days of selection applicants must submit an executed IPMP between the members of the consortia or project team". (Award Info - VI,B,x) | This is not required as part of the submission, but for selected applicants, the IPMP must be submitted during the negotiation process, before the project starts and funding is awarded. |
| 32 | Under AOI 1: CMM Supply Chain, does DOE view tire pyrolysis oil, waste tires, biomass, and/or natural gas as feedstocks of interest? | All feedstocks will be considered under this FOA. |
| 33 | Under AOI 1: CMM Supply Chain, does DOE view | No. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | natural gas as a "conventional ore body"? | |
| 34 | Under AOI 1: CMM Supply Chain, we note that the feedstocks of particular interest are all metals-based. Is DOE interested in any non-metals-based feedstocks for this Area of Interest? | Since the FOA spans the inclusion of many feedstock sources and product outputs, it's up to the applicant to justify why their particular proposal meets the requirement of pilot scale demonstration by the end of the project. See Appendix E for TRL descriptions. |
| 35<br>**(Amended 00005)** | Assume a project team is submitting to pilot project topic 1B. The team consists of a for profit businesses prime, an institution of higher learning sub-recipient, and a non-profit sub-recipient. Given the cost share exemptions for IHL and non-profits, how would we calculate the cost share? Would the prime be responsible for matching only its own allocation of the project cost, or would it be responsible for matching the entire project cost? Would the IHL or non-profit have any cost share requirement? | ~~In this situation the cost share is to be based on the portion of the total budget proposed by each For-Profit entity and is required to be not less than 20% of the total allowable project costs of that entity. IHL or non-profits do not have a cost share requirement, nor is part of the cost share calculation for the For-Profit entity.~~<br><br>Cost share is calculated as a percentage of the Total Project Cost. Total Project Cost is the sum of the Government share, including FFRDC contractor costs if applicable, and the recipient share of allowable costs equals the total allowable costs of the projects. In this situation, the For-Profit Prime Recipient will be responsible for no less than 20% of the total allowable cost which includes Institutes of Higher Education and Non-profit sub-recipients share of allowable costs. |
| 36 | It seems likely that when constructing and operating a pilot, the bulk of the cash expenditure comes in the first half of the project when designing and constructing the pilot facility, and the bulk of the cost share (resources to site and operate the plant) comes at the end of the project. Section III(B)(vi) appears to require a consistent cost share ratio, but the reality would be uneven - less cost share in the front, and more in the back. Can you comment on back-weighting the cost share? Would a proposal with a back-weighted budget be deemed noncompliant? | DOE may agree to front-load its cost-sharing such that the recipient cost-share percentage is below the statutory minimum in early budget periods, (or below the overall project cost-share ratio negotiated by the parties), with the expectation that the recipient will catch-up in later budget periods. |
| 37 | Regarding AOI 4B Phase II: If magnet and battery materials have been demonstrated at bench scale, are they excluded? | No exclusions for AOI 4B. |
| 38<br>**(Amended 00005)** | Regarding the cost share requirement: Are non-exempt institutions required to provide cost share in R&D | The cost share requirement applies to For-Profit sub awardees; however, the Prime Recipient, no matter its entity type, is legally |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | projects, even if an exempt institution is the Prime Recipient? For example, if a university is the lead institution and is partnered with an FFRDC as a subrecipient, is the FFRDC required to provide 20% of its portion of the project budget as cost share? Or is the entire project team exempt from the cost share requirement? | responsible for contributing the entire required cost share. ~~In your example, there would be no cost share as FFRDC would be exempt from the cost share requirement.~~<br><br>In your example, if the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity and subawards to a non-exempt entity, the Prime Recipient is still exempt from providing cost share and cost share requirement will not be a part of the award.<br><br>Note: FFRDC's cost are considered part of Federal Cost share (notable exemptions in the FOA) and funding for the FFRDC will occur outside of the cooperative agreement. |
| 39<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | Are projects involving the recovery and refinement of Uranium withing the scope of work for this FOA under topic 2 and 3? | Only in the case where Uranium would have to be a value-added product from a CMM containing feedstock. |
| 40 | I am just curious if manufacturing of graphite using coal or carbon dioxide of interest to this solicitation? | Graphite is considered a critical material. As long as work is not funded under another Government solicitation it can be proposed. |
| 41<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | Can you please share the template or information that we need to cover in the "Technology Maturation Plan", which is a 15 page (limit) PDF to be submitted as per the table on page 26-27? | **Technology Maturation Plan:**<br>A technology maturation plan (TMP) is a planning tool that summarizes the necessary research and development (R&D) steps to advance the maturation of a specified technology to a targeted technology readiness level (TRL) and defines the key performance metrics that will be used to determine if the targeted TRL has been successfully achieved. A TMP also documents the current TRL of the specified technology, defines the ultimate commercial application of the technology, and conceptualizes a future commercialization pathway in terms of additional R&D, resources, and schedule. A TMP is a high-level summary document. It is not a collection of detailed test plans. The initial TMP is due 90 days after award and should be updated as needed throughout the project period of performance. A final TMP should be submitted at the completion of the project. (See FOA Amendment 0004) |
| 42<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | Can you please share the template or information that we need to cover in the "Project Management Plan", which is a 15 page (limit) PDF to be submitted as per the table on page 26-27? | **The Project Management Plan:**<br>The Project Management Plan (PMP) defines how the Applicant will execute, monitor, and control the project to accomplish the objectives. The specific contents, level of detail, and inclusion of subsidiary |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | planning documents are tailored according to the needs of the project. Consequently, every PMP will be different based on the risk, visibility, and/or complexity of the project and the Recipient's established processes, procedures, and systems. The PMP should be formatted to include the following sections with each section that includes: executive summary; project organization and structure; risk management plan; milestone and milestone log; cost profile; project timeline; and success criteria.<br><br>The Recipient shall update the Project Management Plan 30 days after award and as necessary throughout the project to accurately reflect the current status of the project. Examples of when it may be appropriate to update the Project Management Plan include: (a) project management policy and procedural changes; (b) changes to the technical, cost, and/or schedule baseline for the project; (c) significant changes in scope, methods, or approaches; or (d) as otherwise required to ensure that the plan is the appropriate governing document for the work required to accomplish the project objectives. As the first task in the Statement of Project Objectives, successful Applicants will revise the version of the Project Management Plan that is submitted with their applications by including details from the negotiation process. This Project Management Plan will be updated by the Recipient as the project progresses, and the Recipient must use this plan to report scope, schedule, and budget variances. (See FOA Amendment 0004) |
| 43<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | We are a public university planning to apply for this FOA. Can we apply for multiple AOIs with this FOA?<br><br>Can we submit more than one application for the same AOI?<br><br>If yes, do the PIs need to be different for each application? The FOA does not mention restrictions on the number of submissions per entity. Kindly clarify. | Yes, each application will be evaluated separately regardless if submitting in multiple or same AOI. There is no limit on the number of submissions per entity. |
| 44<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | Can you please share the template or information that we need to cover in the "Environmental Considerations | The Environmental Consideration Summary is not required for this FOA noted as N/A in table, since the proposals don’t involve new |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Summary", which has to be submitted as per the table on page 26-27 of the FOA | construction or modification of existing facilities. |
| 45<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | The table in the section "Full Application Content Requirements" lists two components (Environmental Considerations Summary, Technology Maturation Plan, Project Management Plan) for which there is no detailed guidance on form and content. Could you please provide some detail?<br><br>Are these sections required for all applications, or just applications submitted to AOIs 1B, 2B, 4B? | Environmental Considerations Summary not required for this FOA.<br><br>Technology Maturation Plan: See response to question 41.<br><br>Project Management Plan: See response to question 42 |
| 46<br>~~(Amendment 00004)~~<br>**(Amendment 00005)** | Sections I.D and I.E of the FOA suggest that different components related to community benefits are required depending on the AOI, but Section IV.C does not clearly specify which components are required or optionally allowed, depending on the AOI. In particular, is the Community Partnership Documentation component required (or if not required, allowed) for applications to AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, 5? | ~~The R&D Community Benefits Plan are not required for application to AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, and 5. The R&D Community Benefits Plans are required expected for applications to AOIs 1B, 2B, and 4B.~~<br><br>~~See Appendix G information on the R&D Community Benefits Plan content requirements.~~<br><br>To clarify:<br>AOIs 1B, 2B, and 4B are require to submit:<br>• Community Benefits Plan: Job Quality and Equity<br>• Community Benefits Plan Budget Justification<br>AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, and 5 are require to submit:<br>• R&D Community Benefits Plan. |
| 47<br>**(Amendment 00004)** | Is the intent that a full Statement of Projective Objectives is required for all applications at this time, or just for applications submitted to AOIs 1B, 2B, 4B, considering that most DOE FOAs for projects <$5M typically do not require a SOPO until the award negotiation stage. | The full statement of Project Objectives is required for all applications. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00003 Q&A** | | |
| 48<br>**(Amended 00005)** | We have three universities and one for profit company on our team. We intend to have one of the universities be the lead institution, therefore it seems we do not have a cost share requirement for our application. Is that correct? | ~~Other entity types, including For-Profit entities, whether Prime Recipients (lead organizations) or subawardees (team members), are required to provide not less than 20% cost share for both basic and applied R&D activities. This cost share is to be based on the portion of the total budget proposed by each For-Profit entity and is required to be not less than 20% of the total allowable project costs of that~~ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ~~entity.~~<br><br>Correct, if the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. |
| 49<br>**(Amended 00005)** | If one university is the lead, do the other two universities and the for profit get classified as subrecipients such that the entire award and budget is managed only from the lead university? | Yes, that is correct. The Lead is considered the Prime Recipient and is the legally responsible entity for the agreement. ~~Also, the Prime Recipient is solely responsible for managing cost share contributions by the Project Team and enforcing cost share obligation assumed by Project Team members in subawards or related agreements.~~ [The lined out portion is still factually correct, but no longer germane to the question] |
| 50<br>**(Amendment 0006)** | We are concerned with the short turnaround not giving us enough time to put together a quality proposal. Could you please consider 30 additional days? That would significantly increase the quality of our proposal | The application deadline has been extended to 12/13/2023 5:00 p.m. ET. See FOA amendment 0006. |
| 51<br>**(Amended 00005)** | Does AOI 1 cover the production of graphite from waste carbon emissions? How about the other AOIs? | AOI 1 does include the production of graphite. AOI 2 could be a value-added product from critical minerals containing feedstock. |
| 52<br>**(Amended 00005)** | We are an IHE exempt from the cost share requirement but we will have subawardees who are For-Profit organizations. Will our subawardees have to provide a cost share? | See response to question 35 and 38.<br><br>~~The cost share requirement flows down to For-Profit entities.~~<br><br>If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. |
| 53<br>**(Amended 00005)** | We have a question about the subject FOA: we noticed the cost share exemption for universities and are wondering if this is flowed down to any subs on their project, including For-Profit companies? Meaning if the university, who is exempt for the cost share requirement, is prime, are any subs, regardless of status, also exempt? | See response to question 35 and 38.<br><br>~~The cost share requirement flows down to For-Profit entities.~~<br><br>If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. |
| 54 | If we are submitting to topic 2A then we submit the R&D Community Benefits Plan. What is not clear is if we are also supposed to submit a Community Benefits Plan Budget Justification (excel workbook) or if that is only for the other Community Benefits Plan: Job Quality and Equity, which is more involved. It is unclear in the RFP. | The Community Benefits Plan Budget Justification is not required for the R&D Community Benefits Plan. |
| 55 | The FOA says, "Cost sharing is not required for | See response to question 35 and 38. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(Amended 00005)** | institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations." If an institute of higher ed or nonprofit leads a proposal but has industry subrecipients, does DOE expect that the industry subrecipients still provide the required cost share? | ~~The cost share requirement flows down to For-Profit entities.~~<br>If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00004 Q&A** | | |
| 56 | The 'Products of particular interest' list shown in the FOA does not include graphene. Will a proposal addressing graphene production be considered responsive to the FOA? | AOI 2 could be any carbon material as a value-added product from critical minerals containing feedstock. |
| 57 | Please clarify whether an R&D Community Benefits Plan is required for AOI 1A proposals? The FOA indicates that it is (screenshot attached). The latest Q&A release (#4) indicates that it's not (screenshot attached). | See response to question 46. |
| 58<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | While the FOA clearly states magnet "alternatives and substitutes" are not in scope for AOI 4A Phase I, can you clarify whether development of magnet manufacturing/recycling processes and/or improvements to magnet technology are in scope for other areas of interest, including AOIs 1, 2 and 3? | This FOA is only limiting research around the magnet by itself, but if it's as part of a full process, we will consider under the other AOIs.<br><br>Magnet alternative and substitutes are excluded of this FOA. Please see the recently released AMMTO DE-FOA-0003155 Notice of Intent to Issue Critical Materials Accelerator FOA. The AMMTO NOI's FOA intents to solicit proposals that continue advancing science and technology innovation and de-risking technologies that build and transform domestic critical material supply chains examined through the CMA. Link to NOI: https://www.energy.gov/eere/ammto/notice-intent-issue-critical-materials-accelerator-funding-opportunity-announcement. |
| 59<br>**(Amendment 0006)** | The November 10, 2023 deadline is extremely tight and may limit the ability for respondents to develop high quality proposals. Will the DOE consider extending the submission deadline by 30 days? | The application deadline has been extended to 12/13/2023 5:00 p.m. ET. See FOA amendment 0006. |
| 60 | The funding opportunity in Grants.gov lists "Project Narrative" as an attachment but the FOA does not mention the format or page requirements. Can you provide more information on what is to be included in the Project Narrative? Also, do we submit the required documents from the FOA through FedConnect or | Consider the FOA required Technical Volume as the Project Narrative.<br><br>**To apply to this FOA, applicants must register with and submit application materials through Grants.gov at https://www.grants.gov/.** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Grants.gov? | There is contradictory information under in the FOA that is corrected below and in amendment 0005.<br><br>**B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements**<br>**3. Grants.gov**<br>Register in Grants.gov (http://www.grants.gov) to receive automatic updates when Amendments to this FOA are posted. ~~Please note that Letters of Intent, Concept Papers, and Full Applications will **not** be accepted through Grants.gov.~~<br><br>See FOA Amendment 0005 |
| 61<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | Do polymetallic nodules located in US contract areas of the Clarion-Clipperton Zone count as domestic supply? | Yes, the polymetallic nodules could be considered domestic supply if shown that they are located within US contract areas of the CCZ. |
| 62 | There is a minimum 20% cost share requirement in the FOA, however the FOA also states that institutes of higher education are subject to an exemption for a two-year period beginning on August 9, 2022. Could I confirm that this means that any proposal submitted by an IHE between Aug 9, 2022-August 8, 2024 is exempt from the cost share requirement? Or any proposal from an IHE with a Start Date between Aug 9, 2022-August 8, 2024? | *Awards* made prior to 8/8/24 to IHEs or Nonprofits during the 2-year extension are exempt from the cost share requirement in 2 CFR 910.130 for the period of performance of the award (base + any continuations included at time of award). |
| 63<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | Can you verify that cathode materials produced from recycled black mass are considered in scope of interest in AOI 2? This is unclear due to the exclusion of battery and magnet material in AOI 4. | Yes, feedstocks produced from recycled materials are within the scope of value-added products, which includes recycled black mass. |
| 64 | The above referenced DE-FOA-0003105, provides direction on completing and submitting the Budget Justification Workbook for both the Prime and Subs. However, the budget documents attached to the FOA are the Budget Justification Workbook, as well as two other budget documents titled: RR_FedNonFedBudget_2_0-V2.0 and RR_FedNonFed_SubawardBudget_2_0-V2.0. The two additional attached budget documents are not discussed within the FOA, which is also silent regarding | Forms RR_FedNonFedBudget_2_0-V2.0 and RR_FedNonFed_SubawardBudget_2_0-V2.0 are an addendum to the SF-424: Application for Federal Assistance and submission is mandatory. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | if these are required to be completed and submitted. RR_FedNonFedBudget_2_0-V2.0 and RR_FedNonFed_SubawardBudget_2_0-V2.0 required to be completed and submitted with the proposal? | |
| 65 | The response says 'The R&D Community Benefits Plan are not required for application to AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, and 5. The R&D Community Benefits Plans are required for applications to AOIs 1B, 2B, and 4B. See Appendix G information on the R&D Community Benefits Plan content requirements.' There appears to be a typo in the response with regards to which benefits plan is to be included or not. | See the revised response to questions 46. |
| 66 | Thank you for your response on the "technology maturation plan (TMP)". The response states "the initial TMP is due 90 days after the award .." So does it mean that it does not have to be submitted with the full application that is due on Nov 10? | No, it is not required with the application submission. |
| 67 | Does the cost share waiver for Institutions of Higher Education apply to Phase II proposals in response to AOI 2B? | No. The waiver does not apply to Phase II activities. |
| 68 | If an Institution of Higher Education (IHE) is the lead applicant for a proposal with industry sub-recipients, does the cost share waiver apply to the overall project or only the IHEs portion of the total project budget? | If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. In this example, the entire total project budget would be exempt. |
| 69 | The FOA seems to suggest that cost share is based on the total project cost, regardless of the members of the actual team. So, if the team consists of at least one (1) non-exempt entity, then the cost share total is derived from the total project costs. However, questions 28 and 38 of the FAQ seem to suggest that the portions of the project costs that are born by exempt entities are then exempt from the cost share calculation, making the cost share required amount lower. Can you clarify how to calculate the cost share when there are exempt and non-exempt entities partnering on the project? | If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity: The cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees. In this example, the entire total project budget would be exempt.<br><br>If the For-Profit Prime Recipient: The Prime Recipient will be responsible for no less than 20% of the total allowable cost which includes Institutes of Higher Education, Non-profit, and FFRDC(s) sub-recipients' share of allowable costs. |
| 70 | If a National Lab or a University are leading | If a FFRDC is the leading organization, the funding for the FFRDC |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | organizations (for both entities cost share is waved), is For-Profit partner required to provide cost share?<br><br>If yes, for the entire requested funding or only their budget?<br><br>From the Q&A on the DOE website: "Awards made to IHEs or Nonprofits during the 2-year extension are exempt from the cost share requirement in 2 CFR 910.130 for the period of performance of the award (base + any continuations included at time of award)". This answer does not make any determination regarding For-Profit collaborator. | will be excluded in the award and the For-Profit partner will be the Prime Recipient of the award and will be subjected to cost-share.<br><br>If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to a non-exempt sub-awardee. |
| 71<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | Appendix B, page 97: "Non-federal cost share is not mandated for outreach = $0 (non-federal share)". What is definition for outreach? | Outreach, with regard to research, the term refers to the communication of research results and scientific knowledge to a wide audience (e.g., journal publications, workshops, public talks/ presentations at conferences. |
| 72<br>**(Amendment 0006)** | The FOA indicates that the Full Application should "expand upon information in the Concept Paper." Can you clarify if a Concept Paper was required to submitted under this FOA? | This instruction has been deleted, see amendment 0006 of the FOA. |
| 73 | Does an R&D Community Benefits Plan require a separate budget justification workbook? | No. See the revised response to question 46. |
| 74 | Per section I.D of Amendment 4 of the FOA, 'Community Benefits Plan' are required for AOIs 1B, 2B, 4B. Per section I.E of Amendment 4 of the FOA, 'R&D Community Benefits Plan' are required for AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, 5A. Please clarify the response to question 46, which says otherwise. | See the revised response to question 46. |
| 75<br>**(Revised response Amendment 0006)** | Is the Community Partnership Documentation (section IV.C.v of Amendment 4 of the FOA) required for AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, 5A? | Yes, it is ~~required~~ applies for all AOIs. |
| 76 | I have read the Q&As but did not find a clear and adequate response to our cost share situation. If the prime is an Institution of Higher Education and the subcontractor is a For-Profit entity, if the IHE is cost | If the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to a non-exempt sub-awardee. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | share exempt, does the For-Profit then only need to cost share 20% of their total subcontracted budgeted amount? Therefore the total cost share for the project will not equate to 20% of the total project budget. Is this correct? | |
| 77 | It looks like the budget form on grants.gov is not correct. It looks like it's the budget form for SBIRs since it has a fee included in it. Also, there is no place for cost sharing in it. Are we supposed to be using the attached standard budget justification form for these types of proposals?<br><br>If we are in fact supposed to be using the attached form, how do we upload it to grants.gov? | This is the correct form. Cost Share is indicated by the allocation between "Federal" and "Non-Federal" costs.<br><br>Documents can be uploaded using subforms: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kKClPZNOtsc |
| 78<br>**(Amendment 0006)** | One of the FAQs says there is a pending decision regarding deadline extension. When will that decision be made? | The application deadline has been extended to 12/13/2023 5:00 p.m. ET. See FOA amendment 0006. |
| 79 | In the FOA, it says to upload all of the resumes as a single attachment. I'm assuming that it means in Field 12. However there is a place on the Research and Related Key Personnel page to upload the resume for each key personnel. Do we need to do both? | Uploading a single document with all the resumes will suffice. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00005 Q&A** | | |
| 80 | We wanted to clarify whether we needed to submit files for the Technology Maturation Plan (TMP) and Project Management Plan (PMP) at the application stage or if both of these files were not required until after award? It seemed that the Q&A information indicated that the file(s) were not needed until the award stage but the table of full application content requirements in the updated (Amendment 4) of the FOA still shows both files required at the application stage so we are not quite sure what is required at which stage. | The initial TMP is due 90 days after award and should be updated as needed throughout the project period of performance. An applicant may provide the TMP at application.<br><br>The PMP shall be provided with the application and updated 30 days after award. |
| 81 | Are multiple AOI's allowed? | An applicant can apply to multiple AOIs. |
| 82 | Is it permissible to mention industrial partners who will not be funded? (i.e., unfunded collaboration?) I understand that letters of participation/support are not allowed unless they are seeking funds. Same question) | Yes, all partners shall be mentioned. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | with international unfunded collaborators/colleagues. | |
| 83<br>**(Supplemented in amendment 0007)** | Please confirm: it seems that the Intellectual Property Management Plan must be provided in the initial submission but executed only if a grant is awarded? Would an IP plan need to be completed if participating companies or collaborators are not receiving funds? | Within 30 days of selection, applicants must submit an *executed* IPMP between the members of the consortia or project team (including non-funded partners). |
| 84<br>**(Amendment 0006)** | Is a 15 page SOPO and 15 page PMP both required with the original proposal submission? Or is the PMP just an updated SOPO during award negotiations? | The SOPO and PMP are both required with the application submission. See amendment 0006 concerning PMP content. |
| 85 | Letters of Commitment are only required when cost share is applicable, but not otherwise, correct? | Correct. |
| 86 | The FOA mentions that we must complete the Budget Justification Workbook, but there is no attachment that I can find. Where can I find the correct version of this form | Please see the FOA in FedConnect to find a copy of the attachment: Note the name of the attachment is Budget Justification Worksheet instead of Workbook, but they are the same document. https://www.fedconnect.net/FedConnect/default.aspx?doc=DE-FOA-0003105&agency=DOE |
| 87 | The FOA does not indicated where required files should be uploaded in Grants.gov. Should they be attached as separate attachments in R&F Other Project Information? | See the response to question 77. |
| 88 | Pt 1. Section I.E of the FOA states a R&D Community Benefits Plan is required for AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, 5. Question 46 (Amendment 00004) of the Q&A states a R&D Community Benefits Plan is not required for application to AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, and 5. Could you please clarify which document is correct?<br><br>Pt 2.The FOA states that lower TRL level projects (AOIs 1A, 2A, 3, 4A, 5) must include a R&D Community Benefits Plan. Will applications for these AOIs include only a R&D Community Benefits Plan, or are both a R&D Community Benefits Plan and a standard Community Benefits plan required? | See the revised response to question 46. |
| 89 | The FOA instructions seem to be optimized for an EERE Exchange submission not a Grants.gov submission. In grants.gov, the SF424, Budgets, budget justifications, project location, and resumes are entered into forms, | 1) Yes, it is required.<br>2) PDFs are ok. Applicants can submit excel files through FedConnect or email them to ryan.miller@hq.doe.gov. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | which then become part of the submission file upon submission. Incomplete forms prevent submission. 1) Is it required to separately attach all of these to the submission? The FOA indicates that, but that will cause a lot of duplication of effort. 2) grants.gov does not allow for excel files to uploaded. Assuming duplicate budget excel files are required, is it ok to save the budget excel files as pdfs? Or should we email them after submission and to whom? | |
| 90 | Pt. 1 Based on the response to question 70, for a situation where an FFRDC is the "lead" for the proposed project, please confirm that the lead FFRDC should NOT include partners as subcontractors in its budget.<br><br>Pt. 2 Additionally, will the FFRDC be expected to enter into a CRADA with the "Prime"? How should we approach this if there are multiple partners?<br><br>Pt. 3 Will all non-FFRDC partners receive separate awards, or will one be designated as "Prime" and subcontract to the other non-FFRDC partners? | Pt. 1 If the FFRDC is the "lead" they shall include all partners, subcontractors, and vendors in their budget.<br><br>Pt. 2 Yes, if a DOE/NNSA FFRDC is selected for award negotiation, the proposed work will be authorized under the DOE work authorization process and performed under the laboratory's Management and Operating (M&O) contract. The "Prime" will be the partner with the most funding within the approved cooperative agreement budget.<br><br>Pt. 3 One be designated as "Prime" (see Pt. 2) and subcontract/subaward to the other non-FFRDC partners. |
| 91<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | Is DOE interested in unconventional mining concepts? Per the FOA, AOI 3 seeks proposals that "focus on the optimization of cost, environmental emissions and resource usage or intensity within extraction, production, separation, processing, refining, alloying, manufacturing, or recycling technologies." Does "extraction" in this context include innovative mining technologies, or is this AOI focused exclusively on extraction of critical materials from ores? | Yes, DOE is interested in unconventional mining concepts for CM. Extraction does include innovative mining technologies. |
| 92 | What topics require the community benefit plan budget justification? | See the revised response to question 45. |
| 93 | Page 15 of the FOA states: In most cases, FFRDCs are funded independently of the remainder of the project team. The FFRDC then executes an agreement with any non-FFRDC project team members to arrange work | If the FFRDC is the lead, the funding mechanism will be through the DOE work authorization system for DOE/NNSA FFRDCs. The entity that is receiving the most funding, other than the FFRDC, will become the prime recipient and legally responsible for the efforts |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | structure, project execution, and any other matters.<br><br>Please confirm this means that, if an FFRDC leads, funding for non-lab partners (i.e. universities) will be included in the award to the FFRDC and the national lab will be responsible for disbursing those funds through an agreement (i.e. subcontract). | under the cooperative agreement, which will exclude the FFRDC. |
| 94 | Page 23 of the FOA states: Unless instructed otherwise by the DOE Contracting Officer for the DOE award, all FFRDCs are required to enter into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement25 (CRADA) or, if the role of the DOE/NNSA FFRDC is limited to technical assistance and intellectual property is not anticipated to be generated from the DOE/NNSA FFRDC's work, a Technical Assistance Agreement (TAA), with at least the prime recipient before any project work begins.<br><br>Please confirm this is a requirement even if the FFRDC is the prime recipient. If so, must all the non-lab partners be party to the CRADA?<br><br>Multi-party CRADAs take considerable time to execute. Please confirm that a multi-party CRADA would have to be executed before work can begin. | All non-Federal party partners who provide some level of collaboration in the R&D activities would be required to enter into a CRADA with the FFRDC. The non-Federal party contribution must be more than financial and/or equipment or the development of a statement of work, that is, the non-federal party must collaborate. |
| 95<br>**(Amendment 0007)** | Would Sodium-ion batteries fall under the scope of this call, specifically AOI5? | Yes, sodium-ion batteries could potentially fall under AOI5, if they meet the "next" high performance battery technology, along with improvements to current battery recycling technologies and other alternative energy technologies that have chemistries able to be predominantly sourced domestically and from friendly countries |
| 96 | Are community benefits plan costs associated with Phase II pilot proposals exempt from cost share? | Only R&D or Demonstration Tasks are subject to cost share; however, community benefits plan's costs can be part of the non-federal contribution to cost share. |
| 97 | Could you please confirm that the Excel Budget Justification is not needed since the RR Budget forms are both to be filled out directly within the application site. | See the response to 64 and 89. The Budget Justification workbook is required. Yes, a Word document can be submitted. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Also, please confirm that a written budget justification "word document" can be attached to the RR Budget as usually submitted. | |
| 98 | Do the exemptions for cost share in Phase I also apply to Phase II? In other words, would institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations be exempt from cost share for Phase I but required to provide cost share in Phase II? | No, the exemption applied only for institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations from the 20% cost share requirement for R&D activities. See response to question 67. |
| 99 | There are currently Q&As 1, 2, 4, and 5. Is there are Q&A 3 that is missing from FedConnect? | This document contains the entirety of the questions and most up to date responses. |
| 100 | Can a nonprofit/institution of higher ed still supply a small portion of cost share but not be beholden to the 20% threshold? | Non-profits and IHE may provide cost share. |
| 101 | In most other DOE solicitations, the SOPO template that is provided contains pre-determined tasks and deliverables requisite for all awards issued under the FOA (e.g., project management/PMP, technology maturation/TMP, etc.). I believe this makes managing awards issued under the FOA easier for DOE. The FOA issued has no such tasks or deliverables. Will an amended SOPO be issued with DOE's standard project tasks and deliverables that project teams can then add to as with other solicitations? | See FOA Amendment 0006 for PMP content guidance. |
| 102 | The response for question 44 states, "The Environmental Consideration Summary is not required for this FOA noted as N/A in table, since the proposals don't involve new construction or modification of existing facilities." Many items are marked as N/A in the table. Are they not required as well? | Many of N/As are for page limits, or that the document is not needed at the application stage, but the document may be required later. FOA Amendment 0006 removes the Environmental Consideration Summary from the Full Application Content Requirements table. |
| 103 | The FOA states that "applicants may submit documentation to demonstrate existing or planned partnerships with community entities, such as organizations that work with local stakeholders most vulnerable to or affected by the project." Question 75 in the Q&A states that it is required. Is this a requirement for submission or is it an item that may be submitted to | The response to question 75 has been revised to remove the implication that it is required. The Community Partnership Documentation is an item that may be submitted to strengthen an application. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | strengthen a proposal if bidders have such documentation? | |
| 104 | Environmental Considerations Summary: I do not see any information in the NOFO related to this required application item. Where can I find additional guidance for this? | See Response to question 102. |
| 105 | The Technology Maturation Plan is listed as part of the Full Application requirements, but on page 45 of the guidance, it states the TMP is not due until 90 days after award. Given this, should we submit a Technical Maturation Plan at the time of submission (by 11/10) or do we have until 90 days post-award to submit the TMP? | An applicant can do either. |
| 106 | I am writing to inquire about the budget period. In the FOA, it is said that a budget period can be between 12-18 month. However, we know that for DOE project, the budget period is normally 12 months. Thus, the budget justification is also arranged on an annual basis. Based on the condition of our project, we would like to propose a project of 18 month. Is it ok if we just propose one budget period of 18 month?<br><br>If so, shall we make the budget justification accordingly or still make it on an annual basis? | Yes, a single budget period of 18 months is acceptable, and the budget justification can be adjusted accordingly. |
| 107 | We note there is a requirement to label all proposal documents with a control number generated in workspace/grants.gov. However, we use a system-to-system (S2S) program (Cayuse 424) that submits to grants.gov, which is common for universities. Because we are using an S2S application, no control number is generated. Only a grants.gov number after submission. Is there any way for us to still submit with our usual software program? For example, can we add PI name and our organization as our control or some similar identifier that we create? | Yes, the prime's UEI (see the response to question 11). |
| 108 | Referring to pages 26-27 of the FOA: The table of Full Application Content Requirements includes both a | See the response to question 80. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Project Management Plan (PMP) and a Technology Maturation Plan (TMP). However, most recent Q&A document (Amendment 00005) indicates that an initial TMP is due 90 days after award and the PMP should be updated 30 days after award. Please clarify 1) if a TMP is required for proposal submission, and 2) if a PMP is required for proposal submission. | |
| 109 | We are planning to do an 18 month project. Can we do two 9-month budget periods or do we have to do a 1-year budget period and then a 6 month budget period? Or do we have to do one 18-month budget period? | Typically, budget periods are established on an annual basis. In some cases, shorter or longer budget periods may be established for compelling programmatic or administrative reasons, such as to allow for project phases not evenly divisible with 12-month increments or to provide program personnel with logical decision points to evaluate whether the project should proceed. Periods of performance less than 12 months should have a co-extensive budget period and period of performance. Therefore, if there is a logical reason for two 9-month periods, then that would be acceptable. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00006 Q&A** | | |
| 110<br>**(Amendment 0009)** | For the pilot production demonstration, will construction and renovation be allowed by the grant? Is it okay not to currently have a build available for the pilot line? If so, what documentation will be required for the budget justification of construction and renovation? | Constructions and renovations will be allowed, specifics will need to be detailed in the submission. Details will be required on the proposed build if one is not currently available. |
| 111 | There is conflicting information about IPMPs in Amendment 00003(line 31) and Amendment 00006 (line 83) of the Q&A:<br><br>Line 31: This is not required as part of the submission, but for selected applicants, the IPMP must be submitted during the negotiation process, before the project starts and funding is awarded.<br><br>Line 83: Applicants must submit an executed Intellectual Property Management Plan (IPMP) between the members of the consortia or project team (including non-funded partners). | See revised response to question 83. The executed IPMP is due within 30 days from the selection, and applicants must submit an executed IPMP between the members of the consortia or project team. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Please clarify if an executed IPMP is required at the time of proposal submission (as part of the proposal package) or if it will be required upon award.<br><br>Note, IPMPs are formal agreements negotiated between parties in an awarded/authorized project and commonly take weeks to months to negotiate, depending on each entity's Legal reviews. | |
| 112 | In the NSF Fillable pdf for a Biosketch, it says the form will no longer be accepted after Oct. 23, 2023. It appears to be the same for the CPS form. Does that deadline apply to this FOA? Do we really have to use the SciENcv forms for this proposal? | The Biossketch form is an alternative that the applicant may utilize and will be accepted regardless of the 10/23/23 NSF date.<br><br>The CPS form is not required with the application but is required within 30 days of the selection notice. |
| 113 | Referring to Amendment 00006 of the Q&A document, line 83 indicates IPMPs are required and line 90 indicates a CRADAs will be required.<br><br>Please confirm that BOTH mechanisms will be required to handle IP in cases where an FFRDC is the prime recipient. Also, would the sponsor consider executing *only* a CRADA to handle IP so that there are not multiple agreements in place for the same purpose? Most FFRDCs treat IPMPs as legally binding documents that must be negotiated with Legal teams at all partnering institutions. | Yes, both mechanisms will be utilized depending on the recipient. If a FFRDC then a CRADA will be negotiated with the prime National Lab, if proposal is selected. |
| 114<br>**(Amendment 0009)** | Our proposal includes industry partners who are contributing in-kind cost share in the form of samples but are NOT receiving federal funds and are NOT involved in the R&D. Will these non-funded partners be required to enter into a CRADA with the FFRDC prime? | If the partner is not providing collaboration in R&D activities, a CRADA may not be required. Pending the full context of the actual partnership will depend on if a CRADA is, or is not, required. |
| 115 | Where should we upload the contents of the Full Application (e.g., technical volume, resumes, Community Benefits Plan etc.) that are not listed as 'forms' (see list below) in the grants.gov Workspace?<br><br>List of 'forms' we currently see in grants.gov Workspace: | See the response to question 77. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | - SF424 (R & R) [V5.0], Research & Related Budget (Total Fed + Non-Fed) [V2.0]<br>- Project/Performance Site Location(s) [V4.0]<br>- Research and Related Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded) [V4.0]<br>- Research And Related Other Project Information [V1.4]<br>- Research & Related Subaward Budget (Total Fed + Non-Fed) Attachment(s) Form [V2.0]<br>- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) [V2.0] | |
| 116 | The application requirement table lists 'Current and Pending Support' as a required document but is not spoken to in the ensuing section like the other requirements in the table. Is this required and if so, is there a template or parameters to use for creating/submitting it? | As a reminder Current and Pending Support Disclosures are required 30 days after selection and not required for the initial application.<br><br>The information may be provided in the format approved by the National Science Foundation (NSF), which may be generated by the Science Experts Network Curriculum Vitae (SciENcv), a cooperative venture maintained at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sciencv/, and is also available at<br><br>https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/nsfapprovedformats/cps.pdf<br><br>The use of a format required by another agency is intended to reduce the administrative burden to researchers by promoting the use of common formats.<br><br>Each current and pending support disclosure must be signed and dated and include the following certification statement:<br><br>*I, [Full Name and Title], certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that the information contained in this Current and Pending Support Disclosure Statement is true, complete, and accurate. I understand that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent information, misrepresentations, half-truths, or omissions of any material fact, may* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *subject me to criminal, civil or administrative penalties for fraud, false statements, false claims or otherwise. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and 287, and 31 U.S.C. 3729-3733 and 3801-3812). I further understand and agree that (1) the statements and representations made herein are material to DOE's funding decision, and (2) I have a responsibility to update the disclosures during the period of performance of the award should circumstances change which impact the responses provided above.*<br><br>If the fillable PDF NSF format is used, the individual must still include a signature, date, and a certification statement using the language included in the paragraph above. If the online version is used in SciENcv, a signature, date, and a certification statement must be attached until the SciENcv website automatically attaches a certification statement. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00007 Q&A** | | |
| 117 | Pt. 1: If the FFRDC is the prime, and we [for-profit] are the subrecipient, then according to answer to Question 70, we will have to provide the cost share for just our part of the budget.<br><br>Pt. 2: If we are the prime, and FFRDC is the subrecipient, then according to answer to Question 35, we [for-profit] will have to provide the cost share for both our and FFRDC's part of the budget.<br><br>Pt. 3: So if the FFRDC is the prime, do we not have to provide the cost share for the FFRDC part of the budget? | Pt. 1: In your scenario, the FFRDC portion will be excluded in the award and the for-profit partner will be the Prime Recipient of the award and will be subjected to cost-share. Cost sharing is calculated as a percentage of the Total Project Cost. FFRDC costs must be included in Total Project Costs as FFRDC costs are considered part of the Federal share.<br><br>Pt. 2: Correct.<br><br>Pt. 3: Incorrect, see Pt. 1 response. |
| 118<br>**(Amendment 0009)** | AOI 5 includes "alternative energy technologies that have chemistries able to be predominantly sourced domestically and from friendly countries." Is a project within scope if it includes the application of new soft magnetic materials (sourced domestically) to an alternative electric motor design which eliminates the need for REEs in the permanent magnets? | For AOI 5 alternative energy technologies are with scope as long the chemistries can be demonstrated and proven research and meet the material sourced domestically and from friendly countries. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 119 | I would appreciate some clarification regarding the submission of SF424, similar to the guidance provided in question 15 of the Q&A. Specifically, when it comes to SF424, there are two options for completion: the webform and the fillable PDF. In terms of submission, should we complete both the webform and submit the fillable PDF version? Alternatively, is it recommended to complete the webform and then export it as a PDF for submission? Or is it sufficient to only complete the webform?" | Completion of the webform should be sufficient; however, DOE will accept back up methods of submission. |
| 120 **(Amendment 0010)** | Are grant reviewers more interested in Congressional or state gov't level letters endorsing the project, or letters from local community organizations related to DEIA, underserved communities, and workforce organizations. | Any endorsement letters will be taken into consideration during the review process but only accounts for a small portion of the review criteria, see "Section V – Application Review Information" in the funding opportunity. |
| 121 | Grants.gov does not generate a control number, should we be using the workspace number in place of the control number? | See the response to question 11. |
| 122 **(Amendment 0009)** | We are interested in developing a manufacturing process for an 'alternative product', a wide bandgap semiconductor material made with US-abundant feedstock. Our process will also shore up supply chain issues related to critical materials for CHIPS and Science Act projects. Our process does not come from a waste stream or conventional ore. It is not listed explicitly on the DOE's critical materials and minerals website. Are we responsive to AOI5? | For AOI5 you will need to specify the alternative product you will be manufacturing and state which critical material it proposing to be an alternative for. |
| 123 | We are a for-profit entity planning to apply for this together with a national lab and academic institution. We will be the major applicant on this and understand that we need to provide cost-share. Our question is if we need to provide cost-share for total costs applied or only for our portion? since the other two are exempt from providing cost share. For instance if for-profit entity share of budget is $200 K, do we only provide cost share for this portion. | Cost share is calculated as a percentage of the Total Project Cost. Total Project Cost is the sum of the Government share, including FFRDC contractor costs (if applicable), and the recipient share of allowable costs equals the total allowable costs of the project. In your scenario since the prime recipient and the legally responsible party is a For-profit entity, cost share would be 20% or 50% (pending on the type of effort) of the total allowable cost of the project which includes the For-profit portion, FFRDC portion, and IHE portion. |
| 124 | Can the Agency clarify whether the cost share is | Please see the revised response to question 38. In your scenario, the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | calculated based on the TOTAL cost of the project INCLUDING FFRDC costs? The FOA and the Q&A's to date seem to be in conflict. For example, the FOA Footnote 19 states that the cost share is based on the total including the FFRDC, but the agency's answers to questions 38, 69, and 70 provide different and inconsistent conclusions. In some cases, DOE indicates that the FFRDC portion is to be included in the TOTAL FEDERAL ASK used to calculate the cost share total, but in other instances it seems that the Agency is directing the FFRDC component to be excluded from the cost share calculation. Please clarify so that we can determine the proper cost share for a project that includes a FFRDC (as the lead partner) and a private entity. | FFRDC portion will be excluded in the award and the For-Profit partner will be the Prime Recipient of the award and will be subjected to cost-share. Cost sharing is calculated as a percentage of the Total Project Cost. FFRDC costs must be included in Total Project Costs as FFRDC costs are considered part of the Federal share. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00008 Q&A** | | |
| 125 | There is conflicting information throughout the Q&A about cost share requirements for teams that are led by exempt entities but include non-exempt entities. Line 48 presents a question about teams that are led by an FFRDC but subaward to a for-profit entity. The answer was that no cost share is required if the lead is exempt and that the "cost share requirement does not flow down to sub-awardees." This guidance is subsequently repeated in lines 52, 53, and 55.<br><br>LINE 48 QUESTION: We have three universities and one for profit company on our team. We intend to have one of the universities be the lead institution, therefore it seems we do not have a cost share requirement for our application. Is that correct?<br><br>LINE 48 ANSWER: Correct, if the Prime Recipient is an exempt entity, the cost share requirement does not flow down to non-exempt sub-awardees.<br><br>Now, in the most recent Q&A amendment, line 117 | In your scenario, if the FFRDC is the lead, they will be funded through the DOE Work Authorization process and will not be the legally responsible entity under the cooperative agreement. The entity that receives the most funding, other than the FFRDC, will become the primary recipient of the cooperative agreement, and pending their entity type, it will determine if they are exempt from cost sharing. If the resultant primary recipient is an IHE or non-profit, there will be no cost share under the agreement. If the resultant primary recipient is a for-profit entity, then a cost share will be required. The entity type of the primary recipient is what dictates whether a cost share is required or not.<br><br>Clarification requested: I can give a firmer answer if I know who the entity (other than the FFRDC) is that will receive the most funding. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | contradicts this guidance and states that a for-profit subrecipient will have to provide 20% cost share of their portion of federal funding.<br><br>Please clarify the cost share requirement for teams where the FFRDC is the lead and a for-profit entity is one of several subs. At this point, budgets have been built based on the guidance provided in line 48 of the Q&A and this clarification is urgently needed. | |
| 126 | In determining the total budget with cost share, I wanted clarification on the table in section II.A.i that shows the available and possible funds for each topic. If we apply for topic 4A, and we are awarded $1M with 20% cost share - would our total budget would be $1.25M? Or is this table showing that $1M would be the total budget including cost share (e.g., $800K award + $200K cost share)? | The table under II. A. i. shows the ceiling of the federal share only, but with cost share, budgets can exceed the total federal share ceiling value as long as the federal share does not exceed the ceiling. Reminder: Applications that exceed the "maximum DOE share for any one individual award (federal share)" will be considered noncompliant. |
| 127<br>**(Amendment 0010)** | Are waste plastics considered a "recycled material" as a potential feedstock under this solicitation? | Any feedstock that contains critical minerals and materials (CMM) can be considered. |
| 128<br>**(Amendment 0010)** | Would replacing copper anode current collectors with specialized aluminum foils be considered in the scope of interest for AOI 4B?<br><br>TRL level descriptions in Appendix E is general and it's hard to ascertain which TRL level we would be at before the grant. We have a pilot roll-to-roll tool that continuously makes the specialty aluminum foil and have made single layer pouch cells with our technology. What TRL levels would you consider our tech development today? What would you want to see to get to the next TRL steps? | Potentially, if a substantial case can be made for the importance of the proposed technology.<br><br>The TRL level are an indication of where the technology is and you are planning on taking it, what advancement(s) you plan to make is more important; you can state where you think it might fall on the TRL scale. |
| 129<br>**(Amendment 0010)** | Would DoE be interested in a consortium management approach to solving all of the AOIs? | Applicants are free to propose any management approach they want to achieve the objectives of the funding opportunity. |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00009 Q&A** | | |
| 130 | Does a company with a pilot scale facility in another country have eligibility for this grant under AOI 1B | To be considered for a phase II award, the application has to be able to demonstrate that the proposed process has been demonstrated on a |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Phase II or do they need to have completed AOI 1A Phase I within America to have their pilot scale facility qualify for AOI 1B Phase II? | continuous/semicontinuous basis at least at a bench scale. |
| 131 | Can you have a single application that starts as a AOI 1A Phase 1 for 12 to 18 months and then after a go/no-go point become an AOI 1B Phase 2 for an additional 12 to 18 months for a total 36 month project? And if so, what are the minimum and maximum award sizes for such a project? | *Response Pending* |
| 132 | Would PGMs and gold as products be responsive and of interest to Topics 1A and 3? They are not currently listed in the "products of particular interest" in Topic 1A, but these metals are present in many of the "feedstocks of particular interest" in Topic 1A and "possible value-added products" in Topic 2. | *Response Pending* |
| **END OF AMENDMENT 00010 Q&A** | | |