



---

**Offshore Wind Science and Research**  
Solicitation 2024-OSW-02

**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS - 03**  
Posting Date: July 30, 2024

---

**UPDATES TO THE Solicitation**

An updated version of the Solicitation is being posted at [Offshore Wind Science and Research | MassCEC](#).

**QUESTIONS AND MASSCEC RESPONSES**

**1. Cost Share**

- 1.1. If a proposed initiative intends to heavily leverage an in-house proprietary model, where substantial labor investment has been committed to its development and ongoing maintenance:
  - Would such prior investment be counted as a form of cost sharing? (07)
    - *Response: No, this would not be counted as cost share. Nevertheless, such leverage of prior investment would be considered in evaluation with respect to budget and funding, specifically "Efficient use of MassCEC funds, . . . and the extent to which other funds are leveraged."*
  - If yes, how would you like such prior capital investment to be documented and demonstrated in the application? (07)
    - *Response: Not applicable.*
- 1.2. The RFP does not define what actions, expenditures, supplemental funds, investments or otherwise would or could constitute cost share.
  - Could you define what actions, expenditures, supplemental funds, investments or otherwise would or could constitute cost share? (08)
    - *Response: Please refer to Sections 7(d) and 7(e) of the template grant agreement.*
  - For a scope in the form of a services agreement, where a firm would perform analysis under contract to MassCEC, what forms would or could cost share take? Does it have to be some 3rd party funder also contributing dollars to the firm providing the service? Could cost share take the form of (i) a discount on the price of the service offered? (ii) prior investment in a tool to be used at no cost or reduced cost in performance of the scope? (iii) other? (08)

- ***Response:** MassCEC does not have a cost share requirement for service agreements. The Solicitation is being updated to reflect this.*

See also question 2.1.

- 1.3. [April 2] [Potential Applicant] is preparing a concept paper in response to the open solicitation. It has come up internally at [Potential Applicant] about whether MassCEC would accept cost share emanating from available Federal program funds. The reason I ask is that under most solicitations that start from DOE or that use Federal money (e.g., NOWRDC) we are not permitted to use Federal money to cost share. Some people here are concerned that this may be the case under this opportunity.

- ***Response:** Please also see the response to question 2.1. In general, MassCEC's interest is that cost share come from a party other than MassCEC. As such, yes, federal funds that are available to the Applicant and applied to the proposed scope of activities may be counted as cost share. Note this language from Section 7(d) of the MassCEC template grant agreement (Solicitation Attachment D): Grantee agrees and acknowledges that its Cost Share may be cash, documented grants from other parties (such as other state or federal agencies or charitable organizations), or a combination thereof. MassCEC would likely apply a similar approach for an award in the form of a service agreement or a more general programmatic commitment.*

- 1.4. [April 2] Can you tell me if the Cost share amount of 25% should be on Direct Costs or Total costs? (14)

- ***Response:** Cost share amounts referenced in Section V of the Solicitation are **preferred**, not mandatory. As such, MassCEC would prefer to see the cost share, if proposed, applied to the total costs for the activity. Applicants should provide a compelling rationale if proposed cost share is less than presented in Section V or is applied to a subset of total project costs.*

- 1.5. [April 2] I have a question regarding the match component cutoff for the budget. The solicitation states that there is a 10% match requirement for MassCEC awards less than \$250k and a 25% match requirement for awards greater than \$250k. Can you clarify whether that \$250k cutoff is for the total project budget or just the amount we are asking from MassCEC? See options A and B I've detailed below to remain at 10% match and please let me know which option is the correct interpretation of the cutoff. (11)

Category	A	B
Total Budget	\$250,000	\$277,778
MassCEC award	\$225,000	\$250,000
Match	\$25,000	\$27,778

- ***Response:** The Solicitation uses the term "cost share" rather than "match." Cost share is expressed as a percentage of overall budget for funded activities. The question highlights some challenges in having a preferred cost share percentage applied as a function of MassCEC grant amount. To address that, MassCEC is modifying the statement of preferred cost share such that the preference applies to total project budget. For projects with a total budget of less than \$300,000 MassCEC prefers a cost share of ten percent (10%). For project budgets of \$300,000 or greater MassCEC prefers*

a cost share of at least twenty-five percent (25%). The table below provides illustrative examples. The Solicitation is being edited and reposted to reflect this change.

Category	A	B	C	D
Total budget	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$400,000
Cost share %	10%	10%	25%	25%
Cost share	\$20,000	\$25,000	\$75,000	\$100,000
MassCEC award	\$180,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$300,000

## 2. Applicant Eligibility

2.1. Is the funding opportunity open to federal scientists? (06) (09)

- **Response:** *MassCEC does not intend to fund the participation of federal employees in research activity. Our assumption is that a federal employee on a project would be compensated by their employer. That said, a federal agency could be a participant in the science or research activity. Any compensation provided by the federal agency for its employees, or other federal support, could count as cost share.*

2.2. [April 2] We have the following question regarding the "Offshore Wind Science and Research: Funding for Projects, Partnerships, and Initiatives" solicitation: An offshore wind consortium, an entity established by state statute and with broad representation on its Advisory Board, identifies and provides some government funding to priority research projects to inform responsible development of floating offshore wind in the region. Is the consortium an eligible entity to apply to partner with MassCEC on research projects of mutual interest in the region? (15)

- **Response:** *Yes, such a consortium would be an eligible Applicant.*

2.3. [April 2] Is the "lead applicant" intended to be an individual, in which case we would list all Co-PIs as co-applicants, or is an applicant intended to be an institution, in which case co-applicants are other partner institutions. Furthermore, is the lead applicant contact person intended to be a PI, or should it be the administrative professional handling the business/contracts side. (10a)

- **Response:** *The Applicant will be an entity, not an individual person. From Section V: Applicants may be an individual company, organization, or institution, or may be a team of such entities (an "Applicant").*
- **Response:** *For submittal of Concept Papers, MassCEC prefers the Applicant contact be the principal investigator or other person responsible for the project scope. You can also include an administrative contact person if you wish but that is not required.*

## 3. Project Scope and Eligibility

3.1. What TRL (technology readiness level) does the research project need to target (e.g., basic research, applied research, demonstration)? (01)

- ***Response:** With respect to technology readiness, MassCEC is most interested in applied research and demonstration roughly corresponding to TRL 6 and higher. That said, the concept of TRL may not apply to all proposals.*
- 3.2. Do you think the acoustic impact modeling of noise mitigation of the device from [name of company that submitted a funding proposal to U.S. Dept. of Energy] would be a good fit for this? (01)
- ***Response:** MassCEC does not intend to provide cost share funding through this solicitation for research proposed to U.S. DOE under a DOE funding opportunity. If the proposed activities were either a cost share or supplemental to the scope proposed to U.S. DOE, then the Applicant should look to MassCEC's AmplifyMass program.*
- 3.3. Do you think exploratory research in coupling offshore wind with aquaculture or Power to X (e.g., hydrogen generation) would be a good fit? (01)
- ***Response:** MassCEC would review Concept Papers related to these activities. We don't say at this stage whether such concepts would be a good fit.*
- 3.4. To what extent should the scope of proposed activities include coordination with organizations such as the Regional Wildlife Science Collaborative on Offshore Wind and/or the Responsible Offshore Science Alliance? (02)
- ***Response:** For any activities related to offshore wind and wildlife, habitat, or fisheries, MassCEC recommends the Applicant include scope and budget for coordination with the Regional Wildlife Science Collaborative on Offshore Wind and/or the Responsible Offshore Science Alliance.*
- 3.5. [What are MassCEC's] expectations for budget and time frame. Ideally, I think this could be a two-year project, but could be scaled down to one year if needed. Would two years be ok? (03)
- ***Response:** A two-year project would be acceptable. Please refer to Section I of the Solicitation which states:*
- The Solicitation is open to a variety of proposed activities. Responses could relate to a well-defined, relatively short-term (e.g., two to three years), science or research project that could be supported through a MassCEC grant or service agreement. In this case, the response would articulate the specific scope, work plan, budget, and cost share for the proposed activity. MassCEC is also interested in proposals for longer-term (e.g., greater than three years) or more complex activities such as establishment or expansion of partnerships, collaboratives, or operations in Massachusetts. In this case, the proposal would articulate the form of technical, financial, or programmatic support that MassCEC could provide.

#### 4. Application Requirements

- 4.1. Can you provide a Word version of the Attachment B - AUTHORIZED APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE AND ACCEPTANCE FORM? (04)
- ***Response:** MassCEC only provides this form in pdf format. It can be merged into a longer pdf document or, if necessary, it can be submitted separately.*
- 4.2. Can the submittal of the Attachment B - AUTHORIZED APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE AND ACCEPTANCE FORM be waived for the Concept Paper submittal? (05)

- Response: MassCEC no longer requires submittal of the Attachment B signature and acceptance form with Concept Papers. The solicitation is being modified and re-released to reflect this.

4.3. [April 2] One other question we had is whether references should be included in the text of the Project Narrative. If so, do they count toward the 3-page limit? (10b)

- Response: MassCEC has not requested references. If desired, Applicants may provide references separate from the Project Narrative. These would not count toward the page limit.

4.4. [April 2] I have a question in regard to the concept paper. I noted under the requirements for the concept paper that Attachment B needs to be submitted with the concept paper submittal. I noticed under full application that attachment C needs to be submitted. When do D & E need to be submitted? (12)

- Response: Regarding Attachment B, please see question/response 4.2. Attachment B is not required for Concept Papers.
- Response: Attachments D and E are template grant agreement and service agreement, respectively. Per Solicitation Section VII, item 8 in the table of application requirements calls for Full Applications to include any comments and/or proposed edits to the relevant template agreement. For example, for a Full Application requesting a grant, provide comments on the Grant Agreement, Attachment D.

## 5. Budget

5.1. [April 2] The [Potential Applicant] will be submitting a Concept Paper to the following [Solicitation]. Does MassCEC allow us to use our DHHS (U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services) Negotiated Indirect Rate for the Proposal?

- Response: Applicant may propose the Negotiated Indirect Rate but MassCEC will want to review the specific elements of the proposed indirect rate.

1.2. [NEW July 30] Since the submission of our concept paper [staff person] has been promoted and their salary has increased. Our fringe and indirect rates have also slightly changed. When we present the [scope as proposed in the Concept Paper], is it OK if the associated budget reflects those changes?

- Response: Yes, it is acceptable to use updated inputs for calculation of the budget. Please include a brief explanation of any changes in inputs for budget calculation as part of the Full Application.

## 6. Uncategorized (NEW July 30)

6.1. The scope of activities presented in our Full Application differs from that proposed in our Concept Paper. Is that acceptable?

Response: Yes, it is acceptable to propose an updated scope of activities in the Full Application. Please include a brief explanation of how the scope differs from that proposed in the Concept Paper, and the rationale for those changes.

6.2. Regarding the provision in MassCEC's response to question 3.4, can MassCEC provide some clarity on what "including scope and budget for coordination" with RWSC and/or ROSA means? Does that mean including funding that will be directed towards these organizations or does that mean including funding to support our staff so that they may coordinate project activities with RWSC/ROSA?

➤ Response: *The extent of coordination will depend upon the proposed science or research activities and should be determined by the Applicant. The coordination could include activities performed by RWSC or ROSA, and budgeted accordingly, or it could simply involve maintaining contact with RWSC/ROSA staff persons or a subcommittee.*

6.3. If awarded, will the funds be awarded as one lump sum to the primary applicant, or would the specified amounts be contracted directly to each partner on the proposal? Will the main applicant be responsible for subcontracting to each partner on the proposal?

➤ Response: *The MassCEC award would be to the primary applicant. MassCEC would enter into a grant agreement or service agreement with that entity which would then be responsible for subcontracting with other parties.*

6.4. With the delay in the application due date, when do you anticipate funds being awarded?

➤ Response: *We anticipate that initial awards would be announced in fall 2024 with contracting and awards to follow.*

6.5. For the "Team" section of the full application, would you like us to include CVs, or just bios for the team members? Is there a preference?

➤ Response: *Bios for team members will be sufficient for MassCEC purposes.*

6.6. For the letters of commitment and support, is there a maximum or minimum number of letters that we should include?

➤ Response: *There is no maximum or minimum.*

6.7. Since we submitted the concept paper, we have identified a better partner than [original organization] for [specified tasks]. We hope to partner with [new organization name] and add [scope description] to the proposed project. This partnership would cost an additional \$\_\_\_\_. We would also add \$\_\_\_\_ for [compensation for participation by external parties].

➤ Response: *Please see the response to question 6.1.*

I am inclined to add this to both the Massachusetts base scope and the [other state] base scope but wanted to get that approved from you first. If that is okay to do moving forward, are you expecting our budget and funding section to be one page for each scenario (both Massachusetts and [other state] addition) or all included in one page?

➤ Response: *Two separate budget pages will be acceptable.*

6.8. Does the 8-page limit for project narrative need to include all the DEI/EJ portions as well? And can figures be excluded from the 8-page total? We are balancing being able to provide enough detail about our project but still keep it under 8 pages.

**Commented [TS1]:** Very long / specified email from Hannah MacDonald on 7/1 – do we include this question in this doc anyways, or just answer her directly?

**Commented [LE2R1]:** i did respond to Hannah directly to indicate this was ok and likely a logical change to the proposal

**Commented [LE3]:** it looks like comment 3.6 was deleted now 6.1

- *Response: The Project Narrative section should provide essential information on all required aspects of the proposal. Figures and/or additional information on specific aspects of the proposal may be included in an attachment.*

6.9. I am working on the payment and deliverable schedule, . . . many of the subcontractors will require payment upfront for their time and services over the course of the project. As such, I am struggling to figure out how to spread out the funding w/ deliverables rather than ask for the majority of it as an initial lump sum. Any suggestions? Or is that allowed if required, as noted in the solicitation: "In special cases MassCEC may agree to make payments on a time and materials basis."

Commented [TS4]: Both from Margaret Chory on 7/10

- *Response: It would be unusual for MassCEC to advance funds prior to the performance of specific tasks. Applicant is welcome to propose such a payment schedule, but this will be subject to careful MassCEC review and risk assessment.*

*"Time and materials" payments refers to an entity billing MassCEC for actual time spent on an activity and/or materials purchased. As such, time and materials billing are inherently on a reimbursement basis.*

6.10. The grant agreement has conflicting information on the use of information delivered by the Grantee, especially if the information is confidential vs non-confidential. Since we would want to protect our confidential information, is the expectation of all information (reports, deliverables) to be delivered to Mass CEC to be non-confidential to comply with the Mass Public Records Law, in which case we would withhold sending anything confidential? If confidential information is sent to Mass CEC, would that information be held in confidence and under what terms?

- *Response: One approach for a project that involves the generation of confidential information is for Grantee to not include such confidential information in deliverables submitted to MassCEC.*

*MassCEC's ability to hold confidential information in confidence is described in Section 15 of the template grant agreement. Applicant may request to discuss these provisions with MassCEC counsel.*