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# GENERAL INFORMATION

1. **QUESTION:** Will the Joint Workshop PowerPoint Presentation and recording be available for the public?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, all materials for the solicitations, including information from the Joint Pre-Application Workshop for GFO-20-301 – BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation and GFO-20-302 – RAMP 2020 Solicitation, such as the presentation slides, presentation recording, attendee list and questions & answers, will be posted on the solicitation pages on the CEC’s website located here:

BRIDGE page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-301-bringing-rapid-innovation-development-green-energy-bridge-2020>

RAMP page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-302-realizing-accelerated-manufacturing-and-production-clean-energy>

1. **QUESTION:** Where will the most relevant updates and documents for the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation and the RAMP 2020 Solicitation be located?

**RESPONSE:** All materials for each solicitation will be available through the below links:

BRIDGE page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-301-bringing-rapid-innovation-development-green-energy-bridge-2020>

RAMP Page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-302-realizing-accelerated-manufacturing-and-production-clean-energy>

1. **QUESTION:** How many people attended the Joint Workshop for these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** 181 people attended the Joint Workshop for these solicitations. The attendee list is available here: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/media/4304>

1. **QUESTION:** Where and when will the announcement of the BRIDGE and RAMP awardees be posted?

**RESPONSE:** The notice of proposed awards (NOPA) is expected to be posted on the following dates:

BRIDGE 2020: Week of November 30, 2020

URL where NOPA will be found: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-301-bringing-rapid-innovation-development-green-energy-bridge-2020>

RAMP 2020: Week of December 28, 2020

URL where NOPA will be found: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-302-realizing-accelerated-manufacturing-and-production-clean-energy>

1. **QUESTION:** Have similar grant funding opportunities been issued before? If so, how have they changed?

**RESPONSE:** Both funding opportunities have been issued before. The main difference is within the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, which now has a Letter of Private Investment Requirement. Both solicitations also expanded the list of eligible technologies.

1. **QUESTION:** Will these solicitations be released again next year?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC anticipates releasing solicitations similar to these again next year. However, this is contingent upon CPUC approval of the CEC proposed investment initiatives for the 2021 collection period.

1. **QUESTION:** Is the funding received from these solicitations’ federal funds or state funds?

**RESPONSE:** Funding awarded from these solicitations comes from state funds. Funds awarded from these solicitations are funded by the Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) program. EPIC funds are collected through a surcharge to electricity ratepayers of California’s three largest investor-owned utilities (IOUs) – Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company.

1. **QUESTION:** Is this program only for companies in California?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants are not required to be located in California; however, all corporations, limited liability companies (LLCs), limited partnerships (LPs) and limited liability partnerships (LLPs) that conduct intrastate business in California are required to be registered and in good standing with the California Secretary of State prior to its project being recommended for approval at an CEC Business Meeting.

Please also note, for the BRIDGE solicitation, applicants must demonstrate in their response, clear intentions and a viable path to commercializing their technology in California.

Please also note, for the RAMP solicitation, that any direct manufacturing activities and any pilot production lines that are established as a result of activities funded under RAMP must be located in California.

Please also note, in both solicitations there is a scoring criterion which awards points based on funds spent in California. The more funds that are spent outside of California, the fewer points an applicant will receive under this criterion. Please see Section IV of both solicitations for more details.

1. **QUESTION:** Will the CEC be releasing company names with the specific questions asked? Or will it be blacked out before being released to the public?

**RESPONSE:** Questions are not identified by entity/individual who asked them. In some cases, questions may be edited for clarity.

1. **QUESTION:** What does the CEC look for in a project? What does a successful proposal look like?

**RESPONSE:** Under both solicitations the CEC will follow the application evaluation process described in Section IV of the solicitation manuals. If an application passes “Stage One: Application Screening”, it will then be scored in “Stage Two: Application Scoring” according to the scoring criteria found in Section IV.F. Applications will then be ranked according to score and the highest scoring applications will be proposed for award based on the amount of available funding. In summary, the CEC is looking for innovative clean energy technologies that have promising technical and market potential, a clear understanding of the challenges that need to be overcome to advance the technology, a clear plan to use EPIC funds to address those challenges, and a complete team capable of successfully executing the project.

## Empower Innovation

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant is looking for potential partners to apply for these solicitations, does the CEC provide “matchmaking” for applicants?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC provides multiple ways to find partners for funding opportunities.

* 1. Network online on Empower Innovation (<http://empowerinnovation.fund/>) – an online platform designed specifically for the cleantech community. Use the ‘Find a Partner’ feature to announce your interest in a specific funding opportunity and view other interested parties in a trusted environment.
	2. A list of pre-bid workshop attendees and e-mail contact information can be found through the following links:

BRIDGE page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-301-bringing-rapid-innovation-development-green-energy-bridge-2020>

RAMP page: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-302-realizing-accelerated-manufacturing-and-production-clean-energy>

1. **QUESTION:** Does the CEC help applicants get match funds?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not help applicants directly get match funds. If an applicant is looking for a potential partner that can help support the match fund requirements, the CEC encourages the applicant to join the Empower Innovation network. Please refer to Question #11.

1. **QUESTION:** Is there any way a consulting firm or accounting firm can receive funding from this program, or should the applicant be a start-up company to be eligible for this opportunity?

**RESPONSE:** For both solicitations, the prime applicant must be a private, for-profit entity or individual with the rights to commercialize the intellectual property being advanced under the proposed project. If a consulting or accounting firm meets that requirement then it may apply. If a consulting or accounting firm does not meet that requirement then it still may participate and received funds as a subcontractor. The prime applicant should have clear intentions, and a path forward for commercializing the technology. The CEC encourages potential partners to join the Empower Innovation network. Please refer to Question #11.

1. **QUESTION:** How can the CEC help applicants in facilitating a test site under the EPIC program?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not provide test sites for applicants. Applicants looking for a potential partner for test sites are encouraged to join the Empower Innovation network. Please refer to Question #11.

1. **QUESTION:** How does the Empower Innovation website function to link potential investors to projects?

**RESPONSE:** The Empower Innovation platform provides a space where various stakeholders, including investors, can form project teams around funding opportunities. Registered users can express interest in particular funding opportunities and view other users who have also expressed interest in the same opportunity. Empower Innovation has dedicated pages for both the BRIDGE and RAMP solicitations:

BRIDGE: <https://www.empowerinnovation.net/en/custom/funding/view/9731>

RAMP: <https://www.empowerinnovation.net/en/custom/funding/view/9733>

# ADMINISTRATIVE

1. **QUESTION:** Are these solicitations awarding funds provided like up-front grants? Or are funds provided as reimbursement upon invoicing and funds spent? For example, do small businesses/startups need a lot of “cash-on-hand” to execute the grant awards?

**RESPONSE:** For both solicitations the grant funds throughout the agreement term are paid out on a reimbursement basis, so the Recipient must incur the project cost and then submit an invoice to the CEC. The CEC reimburses the Recipient if the invoiced costs are allowable under the agreement budget and the terms and conditions. See Section 8 of the terms and conditions for more detailed information: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-02/EPIC_Standard_Contract_Terms_ada.pdf> .

1. **QUESTION:** What is the CEC’s process to releasing funds to the Recipient? What is the cycle time (how many days) between invoice and reimbursement of funds?

**RESPONSE:** Grant funds are paid out on a reimbursement basis. The Recipient must incur the project cost and then submit an invoice to the CEC. Once the CEC receives the invoice, the CEC will start the review and approval for the invoice, which can take up to 30 calendar days. After CEC approval, the invoiced amount will be sent to the California State Controller’s Office for review and approval, which can take up to 15 business days. A physical check will then be sent out to the Recipient. In total, from the time the CEC receives the invoice to the time the check is sent to the Recipient will usually take between 45 and 60 days.

1. **QUESTION:** What is the typical or suggested time length for agreement under these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Each project can vary and have different timeframes to achieve the goals of the solicitation and the individual project. Typically, a project can be anywhere from 18 months to 4 years. Please see Section I.E. “Key Activities Schedule” of both solicitation manuals for the anticipated start and end dates for agreements resulting from these solicitations.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the Recipient have the right to keep certain findings, inventions, and other information related to work done during the grant period from being released to the public and to deem such confidential and proprietary? If so, how is this process managed by the CEC to ensure confidentiality?

**RESPONSE:** The grant agreement’s Scope of Work determines what deliverables are provided to the CEC during the term of the agreement. These deliverables are typically reports and are not to include the actual intellectual property/technology being developed. If a request for a deliverable comes to the CEC, the CEC is usually required by law to disclose the deliverable. Because of this, CEC staff prefers the information in the deliverables not include or discuss findings, inventions, etc. in a way that could affect the competitive advantage of the Recipient or otherwise disclose information that is confidential. Deliverables should be described in the Scope of Work with these intentions in mind.

Further, if the Recipient believes that certain deliverables will have confidential information included, and the Recipient believes it has a legal basis to keep that information confidential, the Recipient will be given the chance to assert that basis prior to execution of the grant agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** How can an applicant check that the proposed idea will be receptive to the CEC before submitting a full application?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC released an addendum to both solicitations expanding the list of eligible technology topics. Please see the revised allowable technology tables listed in the solicitation manuals. Because this is a competitive solicitation, CEC staff cannot provide any review or comment on a proposed technology or idea that might be included in an application. Applicants should make their case in their proposals, paying particular attention to the scoring criteria listed in Section IV of each solicitation manual.

1. **QUESTION:** Both solicitations stated that applications are due in Windows XP (.doc) format, since this is older technology/software, will the CEC accept in newer version MS office 365 WORD (.docx)?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC will accept Microsoft Office 365 Word (.docx).

1. **QUESTION:** How does the Scope of Work relate to the Budget Form?

**RESPONSE:** The Scope of Work is the place where applicants should describe the specific project activities (called “Tasks” in the Scope of Work) that will occur during the project to accomplish the goals and objectives stated in the application. Applicants should also describe the specific deliverables associated with specific Tasks to show completion of Tasks. The Budget Forms show how the requested funds will be allocated across the various budget categories, such as direct labor, fringe benefits, and materials and miscellaneous costs. There should be consistency among all submitted application documents, including the Scope of Work and Budget Forms. For example, if a project proposes a real-world demonstration of a technology, the Scope of Work should specify the tasks needed to carry out the demonstration (e.g. construction/installation) and the Budget Forms should reflect costs of the labor, materials, equipment, etc. needed to complete the demonstration. Please see the Attachment 5 Scope of Work template and Attachment 7 Budget Forms for specific details and instructions.

1. **QUESTION:** What is the selection procedure for awarded proposals of these solicitations? Is there only one round of evaluation of the application documents?

**RESPONSE:** Applications will be evaluated and scored based on the scoring criteria identified in each solicitation. Please see Section IV of each solicitation for a detailed description of the two stages of application evaluation and the various criteria and the associated points for each criterion. In summary, applications will be evaluated in two stages: Stage One Application Screening, and Stage Two Application Scoring. After applications are submitted, evaluated, and scored, they will be ranked according to score in a Notice of Proposed Award (“NOPA”) that will be posted on the CEC’s website as well as distributed to the EPIC listserv. For those agreements that are proposed for grant funding in the NOPA, CEC staff will then work with the proposed grant Recipient’s staff to develop the full grant agreement, which will be based on the application documents submitted by the applicants. The agreements will then be presented at a CEC Business Meeting for formal approval. If approved, the agreements must then be executed by the Recipient and the CEC.

Please note that there are four application rounds for the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation. For the RAMP 2020 Solicitation, there is only one application round.

1. **QUESTION:** In both solicitations, there is a “Competition Matrix”. In the table, what do “units” represent? Do applicants need to use that term, or can other measurement options be used to compare technology?

**RESPONSE:** The “units” in the competition matrix described in the Project Narrative Form (Attachment 3) represent the appropriate unit of measurement for a given metric identified. For example, if an applicant is proposing an energy efficiency technology, annual kilowatt-hour savings from an established baseline would be an appropriate unit; or if a technology is seeking to increase the energy density of a storage technology, watthour per kilogram would be an appropriate unit of measurement.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a proposal apply for less than the minimum CEC funding limit?

**RESPONSE:** No, applicants must request funding between the minimum and maximum amounts specified in Section I.D. of both solicitations.

1. **QUESTION:** For these solicitations, can the CEC lower the Match Funding Requirement? As advocates for CalSEED awardees, it is recommended to see a lower match funding requirement (e.g. 25-30%), especially in light of the COVID19 uncertainty, but understand the CEC’s point of view that commercially viable clean energy technologies need to be weaned off of public sector funding as part of their commercialization pathway.

**RESPONSE:** The match funding requirements for both solicitations will not be lowered at this time. The CEC may consider lowering the match funding requirements for the subsequent application rounds of BRIDGE if appropriate.

1. **QUESTION:** These solicitations request that applicants have commercial or industrial partners. If a company has several potential partners but those partners have signed NDA’s with them how does the CEC suggest the applicant provide enough information to show partner support of the project?

**RESPONSE:** The BRIDGE and RAMP 2020 Solicitations do not require applicants to have commercial or industrial partners. The CEC does encourage applicants with those partnerships to submit a commitment letter if the commercial or industrial partner is providing match funding or a support letter if not providing match funding but is still supportive of the project or will benefit from or be involved in the project in some other way. Applicants may not submit any confidential information in their proposal and all submitted information will be subject to public disclosure once the Notice of Proposed Awards is issued. If an applicant has potential partners but is subject to non-disclosure agreements, applicants may describe those partnerships in general terms without identifying specific entities. For example, this company/technology is in partnership with a major battery supplier. However, please note that commitment and support letters must identify the individual or entity providing the match funding commitment or support. Commitment letters used to claim match funding must identify the source of the match funding and the amount of match committed. See Attachment 10 of both solicitations for details about commitment and support letters.

1. **QUESTION:** What are the funding allocations for both solicitations? What are the special considerations with match funds and Low-Income/DAC projects? For example, for GFO-20-301, BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation has a maximum award amount of $3M, and the applicant need to provide match funds – there is potentially up to $4.5M available per project?

**RESPONSE:** The grant funding amounts available for each solicitation are described in Section I.D. in each solicitation manual.

For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, applicants may request an additional $500,000 if their project is a demonstration project located in a low-income or disadvantaged community.

Match funding of at least 50% of requested grant funds is required for both solicitations.

# SCORING

1. **QUESTION:** If the two top projects are scored equally, will the project that asks for less money be given preference? This will potentially allow for a larger number of projects to be funded.

**RESPONSE:** The amount of requested CEC funds by applicants does not affect the scoring of the proposal (as long as the requested amount is within the minimum/maximum funding amounts stated in Section I.D. of the solicitation manuals). The CEC evaluates each proposal comprehensively based on the screening and scoring criteria describes in Section IV. E and F in the solicitation manuals. Please refer to those sections for specific details. Depending on the overall ranking, if two proposals received the exact same score the CEC would consider funding both projects provided funding is available.

1. **QUESTION:** Is there any preference given to companies or technologies that specifically target disadvantaged communities for pilot testing and deployment, whether for BRIDGE or RAMP?

**RESPONSE:** For both solicitations, applications may receive preference points if it can demonstrate benefits to the disadvantaged and/or low-income communities. Please refer to Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring”, scoring criterion 9 for complete details.

1. **QUESTION:** In reference to funds spent in versus outside of California - how are the national labs scored? For example, what are the implications with working with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory versus working with Lawrence Livermore National Lab (California)?

**RESPONSE:** Funds spent on labor costs for employees of national labs within California (Lawrence Berkeley National Lab or Lawrence Livermore National Lab), assuming those employees pay California state income taxes on wages received for the work performed, count as funds spent in California. Funds spent on labor costs for employees of entities located outside of California will not be counted as Funds Spent in California unless the work is being conducted in California. Please refer to Section I.L. for complete details.

1. **QUESTION:** Regarding the California IOU ratepayer benefits, how does the CEC score that category if a major share of the products is sold to developing countries?

**RESPONSE:** Proposals will be scored according to the scoring criteria in Section IV.F of the solicitation manuals. A goal of the EPIC program is to invest in clean energy technologies that are beneficial to the electricity ratepayers served by the three large investor-owned utilities and to the state of California. Applicants should discuss applicable potential impacts and benefits to California IOU ratepayers and markets even if they have foreign target markets.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the customer for the given technology be outside of California and how this will influence the scoring?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #32.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the energy reduction for wastewater treatment be considered as a benefit for ratepayers?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, wastewater treatment technologies that reduce energy consumption can be considered a benefit for California IOU ratepayers.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and energy savings that an innovative technology provides be compared to other wastewater treatment technologies based on assumptions and calculations?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, GHG reduction and energy savings that an innovative technology provides can be compared to other wastewater treatment technologies based on assumptions and calculations to show potential impacts and benefits for California IOU ratepayers.

1. **QUESTION:** For these solicitations, can funds be used for office/lab lease? Or is it expected that the applicant furnishes their own space, or absorb such rent costs?

**RESPONSE:** These costs can be included under the indirect costs’ category in the Budget Forms (Attachment 7) and are reimbursable under both solicitations. Please note one of the scoring criteria is the ratio of Direct Labor to Indirect Costs and Budget & Cost Effectiveness. Please see the Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring” for more information.

# APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

## California Companies

1. **QUESTION:** Are these grant funding opportunities open to companies based outside of California?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, companies are not required to be based in California, but must be registered with the California Secretary of State and be in good standing. Note, one scoring criterion in both solicitations takes into consideration the amount of CEC funding spent in California. The less funding spent in California, the lower the proposal will score under this criterion. Please see the Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring”, scoring criterion 6 for more information.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the Prime applicant need to be headquartered in California?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #37.

1. **QUESTION:** Are these solicitations open to large businesses?

**RESPONSE:** A large business may be eligible. BRIDGE is open to all private, for-profit entities and individuals that have previously received a funding award from an eligible CEC program or U.S. federal agency that provides energy research of the technology identified in the proposal and does not fall within the list of ineligible applicants described in Section II.A “Applicant Requirements” in that solicitation. RAMP is open to for-profit commercial entities or individuals with the rights to commercialize the intellectual property advanced under the proposed project and does not fall within the list of ineligible applicants describe in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements” in that solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Does a subcontractor need to be based in California? Can an applicant work with subcontractors out of California?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants can work with subcontractors outside of California, however the percentage of funds spent in California is part of scoring criterion 6 in both solicitations. Please see Question #37.

## Intellectual Property

1. **QUESTION:** What (if any) IP claims would CEC get on the technology or the manufacturing process funded through these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** The intellectual property (IP) provisions of the standard EPIC grant agreement can be found here: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-02/EPIC_Standard_Contract_Terms_ada.pdf>. IP is covered in sections 19-21.

Applicants are encouraged to read those sections in full to understand how the receipt of a grant could affect rights to the project IP. In short, grant Recipients own all intellectual property developed under the grant agreement. However, if grant funds or match funds are used to create, conceive, discover, make, develop, alter, or reduce to practice the IP during or after the Agreement term certain rights to that IP will accrue to the CEC. These rights include a right to royalty payments if the IP is sold, licensed, leased or otherwise transferred and a right to license the IP for governmental purposes.

Prior to execution of the grant agreement, awardees will be asked to identify any “pre-existing IP” the awardee (or its subcontractors) already owns. The CEC makes no ownership, license or royalty claims to pre-existing IP. However, pre-existing IP only retains its identification as pre-existing IP if grant funds or match funds are not used to create, conceive, discover, make, develop, alter, or reduce to practice the pre-existing IP during or after the Agreement term. If grant funds or match funds are used to create, conceive, discover, make, develop, alter, or reduce to practice the pre-existing IP then the royalty rights and licensing rights described in the previous paragraph will accrue to the CEC.

1. **QUESTION:** If the IP was bought by an established company, which is not a start-up company, can that established company apply?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, as long as the established company meets the eligibility requirements of the solicitation. Please refer to Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements” in both solicitations for complete details.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant, who is on the non-eligible list, received the original prior funding, but has an agreement with a private partner to commercialize the technology, is this allowed?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, in this instance the private partner must be the prime applicant and should explain their relationship with the original prior funding Recipient. The applicant must also show they have the rights to commercialize the technology that received prior funding.

1. **QUESTION:** If the initial commercialization of a technology is done originally by a different company than the applicant, can the applicant still apply to these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, as long as the applicant has rights to commercialize the technology. Applicants should provide documentation showing they own or have rights to the IP being advanced as part of the proposal. Please see Question #43.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant apply to these solicitations if the applicant filed a patent last year?

**RESPONSE:** There are no restrictions or requirements regarding when patents were filed. Applicants are eligible to apply if they meet all eligibility requirements described in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements”.

## Dual Submissions

1. **QUESTION:** Would it be potentially possible to apply to both of these solicitations? Or is there not an overlap in the types of application candidates for those the two grants (TRL or otherwise)?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not recommend an applicant apply for both the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation and the RAMP 2020 Solicitation with the same technology. Each solicitation is targeting distinct technology maturity levels – BRIDGE is aimed for technology development and demonstration, while RAMP is specifically for technology that is at prototype stage and ready to start production. It would be inconsistent if the same technology needs funding for real-world demonstrations while also claiming it is ready for manufacturing scale-up.

However, applicants may apply to both solicitations if the technology products are different.

1. **QUESTION:** How does an applicant know if the technology is better for BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation or RAMP 2020 Solicitation? If the technology has been made into several handmade prototypes that could be improved, but there is no pilot production line; would that technology be better in BRIDGE or RAMP?

**RESPONSE:** This is ultimately up to the applicant and what is best for the technology. Guidelines for TRL can be found at <https://www2.lbl.gov/dir/assets/docs/TRL%20guide.pdf>, (Page 9-10) which may help applicants figure out where the technology is on the TRL spectrum.

The RAMP 2020 Solicitation is specifically focused on helping companies move from custom built prototypes to the pilot production stage. The BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation is focused on advancing new technologies to the final form that will be initially sold to customers.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has several technologies within the start-up company that are at different stages for development – some at the applied research stage, some at the demonstration stage, and some at the pilot production stage – can the applicant apply to both solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, applicants can apply with different, distinct technologies to each solicitation. Please note, that the proposal projects should not overlap and should have their own Scope of Work. For BRIDGE 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal per application round. For RAMP 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** Should an applicant apply to BRIDGE or RAMP, or both, if the applicant has some initial promising results from some small-scale demonstrations, but is not ready to scale to manufacturing?

**RESPONSE:** In this instance, applying for BRIDGE for a large or real-world scale demonstration seems appropriate. Applicants should not apply to RAMP if they are not ready to begin scaling their manufacturing. Please also see Question #46.

# TRL/MRL/CRL

1. **QUESTION:** What should be the current technology readiness levels/manufacturing readiness level/commercial readiness level parameters of the innovation be to apply to BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation and RAMP 2020 Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not have strict parameters of TRL/MRL/CRL for technologies in these solicitations. It is up to the applicant to establish these parameters for their proposed technology and apply to the appropriate solicitation. A required attachment for both solicitations is Attachment 13 – Market Readiness Level Calculator. Attachment 13 will be used to provide additional insight regarding the technology and commercialization readiness level of the proposed technology.

Please note, a goal for the RAMP 2020 Solicitation is to achieve MRL8 by the end of the project agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** How flexible is the CEC on the TRL/MRL/CRL for the technology in these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #50.

1. **QUESTION:** How does the CEC assign the TRL/MRL/CRL to the technology?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC utilizes Attachment 13 - Market Readiness Level Calculator for guidance. Please refer to Question #50.

1. **QUESTION:** What is the CEC looking for in terms of testing or results to determining the viability and capability of a technology? Are there ways that the applicant can collaborate on doing tests with a lab or a CEC affiliated lab or university? How does the applicant prove, if they haven’t already, that the technology is capable?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not have affiliated or approved labs. It is up to the applicant to provide documentation to the CEC that shows that the technology is as capable as the applicant claims. Examples may include but are not limited to: measurement and verification reports, market study reports, certifications from a third-party testing facility, descriptions of where the technology has been deployed, or descriptions of partners (either governmental or corporate) that has contributed to the technology’s development.

1. **QUESTION:** How does the applicant prove the legitimacy of the technology without informing the CEC of confidential and proprietary information?

**RESPONSE:** It is up to the applicant on how to best present their technology as being mature enough to warrant this next step of scaling-up production without informing the CEC of confidential and/or proprietary information. Please remember that confidential information is not allowed in applications for these solicitations. Examples of ways an applicant can show technology maturity are provided in the response to Question #53. Applicants may include links to publicly available reports or submit redacted or edited versions of reports to show technology maturity while leaving out certain aspects they consider confidential. For BRIDGE specific applicants, the Previous Project Information Form (Attachment 14) must also be used as validation documentation.

1. **QUESTION:** The anticipated agreement start dates for these solicitations will be in 2021, would an applicant be eligible if the technology’s TRL is at the proper level at the time of the agreement start date versus the time of the application?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants are not required to be at a certain TRL to apply for BRIDGE. For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, the more critical aspect is that the applicant has results from their prior project. For the RAMP 2020 Solicitation, the TRL should be within the later stages and ready to start the production process.

1. **QUESTION:** A technology is presently categorized as TRL5 according to its least mature element, but funding is in place that supports TRL7 and it will be TRL 6 or 7 at the anticipated agreement start date of April 2021. Will the proposal be evaluated in light of the expected TRL at agreement start date?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #55.

1. **QUESTION:** For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, what TRL is required at the start date for Technology Demonstration projects? For context, a Technology Demonstration project that will add additional capabilities to existing technology that will be at TRL7 at the start of the project. The project will take this combined technology to TRL7 and include demonstration in a real-world environment during the project.

**RESPONSE:** There is no required TRL for a Technology Demonstration project. If the bulk of the proposed project is likely to occur in a controlled environment or a laboratory setting, the project will fall into the Applied Research and Development Stage. If the project is primarily taking place in a real-world setting with a pilot-scale or full-scale demonstration unit, the project will fall into the Technology Demonstration and Deployment stage.

1. **QUESTION:** For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, if a technology is currently at TRL6 but will be at TRL7, should the applicant apply as an Applied Research & Development project or as a Technology Demonstration & Deployment?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants can create proposals that overlap between the two areas. Please refer to Question #57.

1. **QUESTION:** If the applicant has a current grant from another source that will finish development of the technology that may overlap with the RAMP Project, would the applicant be able to apply?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, but if there is significant overlap, the proposed technology may not be ready for the RAMP 2020 Solicitation. Technologies that have several uncertainties about the innovation should focus more on the technology development because the success of the RAMP project is dependent on the validation of the technology.

1. **QUESTION:** For the RAMP 2020 Solicitation, is there a requirement to be a specific TRL/MRL at the time of submitting the application?

**RESPONSE:** There is no starting point of TRL/MRL that the CEC is requiring at the time of submission. There should be a focus on the TRL stage rather than the MRL stage, as the applicant need to show that the technology is mature enough and been validated to be ready for manufacturing. Please note, however, that a goal for the RAMP 2020 Solicitation is to achieve MRL8 by the end of the project agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** For the RAMP Solicitation, if an applicant is proposing to scale up manufacturing of one system component and the technology has been demonstrated multiple times with pilot installations, do we have to include another pilot during the project?

**RESPONSE:** RAMP proposals should not include significant amounts of funding or time for conducting pilot demonstrations. Technologies should be mature enough and have already completed real world demonstrations with results that warrant proceeding to manufacturing scale-up. RAMP proposals may include tasks related to validating the developed manufacturing process or similar quality assurance related tasks.

# BRIDGE SOLICITATION SPECIFIC

## Letter of Investment Requirement

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC explain why it is important for a start-up company to have private investment within the last 18 months in order to apply to the BRIDGE Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC is looking to support promising innovative technologies and companies that have the potential to reach market. Recent private investment – or private investment contingent upon a BRIDGE award - is a strong indicator that there are entities beyond government funding programs that see the commercial merits of the technology and are committed bringing it to commercialization.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC amend the requirement for the private investment amount? Historically, private investment for women and people-of-color are harder to obtain – especially give the amount of private investment this solicitation is requiring. Does the CEC give any special considerations to this type of companies for this requirement? Furthermore, not all technology stages are ready for, nor are seeking, private investment so expanding the flexibility between private investment and match fund sources would make application eligibility more diverse and equitable.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC legally is not allowed to provide special advantages for businesses that are women-, minority-, or LGBTQ-owned -businesses, due to who owns the business. For the second question, the CEC has amended the Solicitation Manual regarding the connection between the Match Funding Requirement and the Private Investment Requirement. Private investment is no longer required to be used for the match funding. The CEC may consider further changes to these requirements in subsequent BRIDGE funding rounds if deemed appropriate.

1. **QUESTION:** It is recommended to clarify language around the potential match funding sources. It is commendable that the CEC is thinking through what funding sources are currently available and broadening the eligible sources beyond venture capital. In internal discussions, a few scenarios have played through and are particularly stumbling across the term “Angel Investment” – which the CEC may have deliberately chosen the term as it could catch multiple fact patterns. Assuming that the CEC is looking for an independent investor who is not a family member of the entrepreneur to have objectively assessed the start-up to be investment worthy. Therefore, it is recommend to expand the allowable sources of match funding with an additional category - or define Angel Investment as this category - that reads as follows: “a properly documented funding agreement between the applicant and a legal person who is not a family member of the applicant that meets the standard of a financial security, with a condition of a BRIDGE 2020 grant award as the only allowable contingency”.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC generally agrees with the recommendation and will clarify the requirement in an addendum to the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** How does the CEC want the applicant to provide proof of private investment?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants must provide proof, in the form of a Commitment Letter (Attachment 10), that the applicants have received private investment of at least 50% of the requested grant funds from an eligible entity. The private investment must have been made within 18 months of the solicitation release date. Please see Section I.D. “Funding” for more detail list of eligible investment entities.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an investor state in the commitment letter that they will commit a specific amount of funding towards the proposed project if the applicant is selected for the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please refer to Questions #65.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant provides well over the Match Funds Requirement, can the private investment amount be lowered?

**RESPONSE:** Additional match funding cannot count towards the private investment requirement.

1. **QUESTION:** Is there any preference to the type of investment the CEC is looking for? Is there a specific round of investment the CEC is more interested in? For example, Series A versus Series B, etc.

**RESPONSE:** No, the CEC does not have a specific preference on one investment over another. The private investment must fall within the scope of eligible private investments listed in Section I.D. “Funding”.

1. **QUESTION:** How strict or flexible is the funding widow for obtaining the investment. If there are available private investments that happened before the 18-month window, would that still be eligible to qualify?

**RESPONSE:** Private investments must have been made within 18 months of the solicitation release date. The CEC is looking to support promising technologies that have received relatively recent support from the private sector.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the private investment be obtained after the agreement start date, but within the year?

**RESPONSE:** No, while private investment contingent upon receiving a BRIDGE 2020 award is allowable, the applicant must furnish proof of receipt of the private investment before an award is approved at a Business Meeting. Private investment gained throughout the course of the agreement will not be considered for fulfilling this requirement.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the applicant provide its own investment?

**RESPONSE:** No, the private investment must come from a source identified on the list of eligible private investment listed in Section I.D. “Funding”.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the private investment come from the profits from existing revenue streams from the award Recipient itself?

**RESPONSE:** No, please refer to Question #71.

1. **QUESTION:** Do Investor-Owned Utilities in California qualify as private investment? For example, if Southern California Edison or Pacific Gas and Electric did an equity investment in the company.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, an equity investment from an investor-owned utility qualifies as a corporate strategic investment.

1. **QUESTION:** Will a voucher paid by a corporation/foundation for an accelerator program at a National Lab be considered as eligible private investment?

**RESPONSE:** Vouchers from a corporation/foundation for use at an accelerator do not qualify as private investment.

1. **QUESTION:** Does regulation crowdfunding qualify as private investment and meet the requirement for this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** No, crowdfunding is not an eligible form of investment for the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the private investment have to be directly supporting the proposed technology? How specifically related does the private investment funding need to be to the proposed technology/project.

**RESPONSE:** No, the private investment does not need to directly or solely support the proposed technology since investments are typically made to individuals or companies generally. Commitment letters detailing the investment amounts should include some reference or connection to the proposed technology.

1. **QUESTION:** Would a bridge loan with warrants from an eligible venture capital firm meet the investment requirement thresholds for eligibility? Or does it strictly have to be equity investment?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, a bridge loan with warrants from an eligible venture capital firm would meet the private investment requirement.

1. **QUESTION:** Would convertible notes qualify as private investment?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, convertible notes qualify as private investments.

1. **QUESTION:** Are non-dilutive grants from corporate partners and foundations eligible as qualifying investment?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, as long as the grant is from the private sector, such as corporate partners or foundations. Government grants do not count as private investments.

1. **QUESTION:** Would it be acceptable if a C-Corporation company, who was finishing a CalSEED awarded project that the proposed technology was developed and patented under, spins off the technology and provided funding for a separate C-Corporation company that will be applying to this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, if the original company remains a private entity that provides investment into the spin-off company. The CEC encourages the applicant to be very clear in the proposal to explain the ownership of the innovation and how the new company relates to the existing company and how that relates to the CalSEED award.

## Match Funding Requirement

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC amend the requirement for the match fund eligible sources? Given the goal of the match funding is to demonstrate commercial feasibility, can the CEC add other capital sources to include:
* Product or project revenues from industry. Grants to support pilot demonstrations do not count but any co-funding on a project from a customer does.
* In-kind contributions from industry: This includes space, equipment, materials, and services. Qualifying contributions will help decrease the overall cost of the proposed project and provide a way for smaller industry partners who do not invest in startups to participate.
* Crowdfunding: equity or product-based.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC has modified the eligible match funds allowed, and an addendum to the solicitation manual will be made to the solicitation manual to reflect this requirement. Match funding for this solicitation may be fulfilled with “cash-in-hand”, “in-kind contribution” “equipment”, or “materials”. This will include product and project revenues and crowdfunding, which fall under cash-in-hand. Please refer to Section I.K. “Match Funding”.

1. **QUESTION:** Regarding match funding, could an investor state in the commitment letter that the investor will commit a specific amount towards the proposed project if the applicant is selected for the referenced grant funding opportunity?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC separated the requirements for match funding and private investment in a recent addendum to the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation. Applicants must still provide proof, in the form of Commitment Letters (Attachment 10), that the applicant has met the match funding and private investment requirements, but the source of those commitments can now be separate. For example, applicants may commit their own operating funds or funds from a project partner as match funds, and separately submit proof that they have received a private investment from the eligible list of investment.

Commitment of private investments contingent on receipt of a BRIDGE award **is allowed.**

Commitment of match funding contingent on receipt of a BRIDGE award **is not allowed.**

Applicants may count private investments as match funding if the private investment is **not** **contingent** on receiving a BRIDGE award, and the funds are available to be spent during the term of the agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant consider the amount stated in the Letter of Investment as match funds?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, private investment stated in the Letter of Investment can be used as match if the applicant has access to those funds during the term of the agreement. However, the private investment cannot be contingent on receipt of a BRIDGE award for it to qualify as match funding. Please note, the CEC clarified and separated the match funding requirements from the letter of private investment requirement in a recent addendum to the BRIDGE solicitation. Please see response to Question #82.

1. **QUESTION:** Are non-dilutive grants from corporate partners and foundations eligible as matching funds?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Please see response to Question #82.

1. **QUESTION:** Is money raised through an equity crowdfunding raise considered qualifying match funds?

**RESPONSE:** Money raised through equity crowdfunding can be used to meet the match funding requirement of this solicitation. However, it cannot be used to meet the private investment requirement. Please see response to Question #82.

1. **QUESTION:** Can funds from another grant be used as match funds for the project?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, however the other grant cannot be a CEC grant. Applicants must provide a letter of commitment from the other grant agency stating how much of grant funds may be applied as match.

1. **QUESTION:** Do convertible notes qualify towards the match funding requirement?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, convertible notes may be used to meet the private investment requirement and the match funding requirement. Please see response to Question #82.

1. **QUESTION:** Will a voucher paid by a corporation/foundation for an accelerator program at a National Lab be considered as eligible match funding?

**RESPONSE:** This would be eligible for the match funding requirement of this solicitation provided the voucher funds will be available and spent during the term of the agreement and directly support execution of the proposed project. The voucher amount cannot be used to meet the private investment requirement.

1. **QUESTION:** For the matching funds, there is a commitment to guarantee the availability of the funds for the project. Does this requirement mean that the entirety of the matching funds must be available at the time that the project begins? For example, is $3 million dollar was raised from venture capitalists in January 2020 and the applicant would want to use those dollars as matching funds, does the applicant need to have all $3M available in the bank account when the BRIDGE project starts for it to be considered viable matching funds for the project?

**RESPONSE:** If the entirety of the match funds claimed is “cash-in-hand” then the applicant will need the have the entire amount available at the time of application. There are other forms of match that do not require on-hand funds. For example, applicants may identify equipment or materials to be paid for with match funds – applicants do not need to have the funds for the equipment/materials on hand at the time of application but are expected to pay for the equipment/materials during the term of the agreement with match funds. For purposes of meeting the private investment requirement, an investment contingent on receiving a BRIDGE award is allowed.

1. **QUESTION:** For the Match funding requirements, does an applicant have to show cost-share match on hand?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #89.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant requests $1 Million for the project, does the applicant need to show the CEC the applicant has $500,000 in match commitments?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the applicant must show proof of match funds by submitting a commitment letters, including prime and subcontractors, that: (1) identify the source(s) of the funds; (2) justify the dollar value claimed; (3) provide an unqualified (i.e., without reservation or limitation) commitment that guarantees the availability of the funds for the project; and (4) provide a strategy for replacing the funds if they are significantly reduced or lost. Please see Attachment 10, Commitment and Support Letter Form. Commitment and support letters must be submitted with the application to be considered.

1. **QUESTION:** For BRIDGE's match funding requirement, would additional project funding (co-funding) from one or more investor-owned CA utilities (e.g., SCE and/or PG&E) count as "corporate strategic investment" for eligibility purposes if the utility commits funds to increase the scope and impact of the specific project (rather than funds for equity in the applicant company)?

**RESPONSE:** Co-funding from a separate entity would count as match funding but does not qualify as private investment.

1. **QUESTION:** Would utilities be acceptable match partners for BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, utilities can be match partners. Also, if the match partner is a publicly-owned utility, remember that the Project Narrative Form (Attachment 3) must describe how the project will benefit California investor-owned utility ratepayers. IOU ratepayers are different than publicly-owned utility ratepayers.

1. **QUESTION:** Is it acceptable for a proposal to have matching funds given to one of the subcontractors of the project, not directly to the prime applicant but to support exactly the same technology?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, if they are a major subcontractor. A major subcontractor is a subcontractor receiving at least 25% of the Commission funds or more than $100,000, whichever is less of the two amounts. However, matching funds provided to a subcontractor cannot be used to meet the private sector investment criteria.

1. **QUESTION:** For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, is it okay if the matching funds are provided to one of the co-PIs from university (not directly to the company who is the main applicant)?

**RESPONSE:** The co-Principal Investigator must be a major subcontractor. Please refer to Question #94.

1. **QUESTION:** Are both elements below (a-b) required to be met? For example: If an applicant secures adequate project cost share, but has not received adequate private investment in the prior 18-month period, are they eligible?

a) Proof of min. 50% (of requested grant) private investment in past 18 months (prior funding)

b) Proof of min. 50% (of requested grant) project cost-share for actual proposed costs (future funding)

**RESPONSE:** Yes, both requirements need to be met in order to qualify for BRIDGE funding. Overlap is allowed, if funds remain from the private investment, it can be applied as match. Please also see response to Question #82.

1. **QUESTION:** “Cost share” sources: The solicitation also specifically outlines now that matching funds must be met with “cash-in-hand, equipment, or materials”. Can this come from a CA partner utility? Can the utility utilize their own internal allocated EPIC funds for this?

**RESPONSE:** Investor-owned utilities can serve as project partners and provide match funding. However, they cannot use their allocated EPIC funding as match.

1. **QUESTION:** 50% of requested grant funds: Some of the wording has been altered around this. Ultimately, this regards to 50% of CEC/EPIC funds, as opposed to total project costs, correct?
* Example: If requesting $1M from CEC/EPIC must have $500k in cost share ($1.5M total project costs).

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this is correct.

## Multiple Applications Rounds

1. **QUESTION:** What are the dates for each application round in the BRIDGE Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** The dates for each application round are below:

1st Round Deadline to Submit Applications October 30, 2020 5:00 p.m.

2nd Round Deadline to Submit Applications February 5, 2021 5:00 p.m.

3rd Round Deadline to Submit Applications June 11, 2021 5:00 p.m.

4th Round Deadline to Submit Applications October 8, 2021 5:00 p.m.

1. **QUESTION:** Why does the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation have four application rounds?

**RESPONSE:** There are multiple application rounds for this solicitation to provide an opportunity for applicants who have not yet secured private sector investment or do not have completed project results from their previous award to apply.

1. **QUESTION:** After using the Market Readiness Calculator (Attachment 13) as a tool to identify the technology, manufacturing, and commercialization readiness levels our results are TRL 4, MRL 3, CRL 3. According to those results, would the CEC recommend the applicant to apply to BRIDGE funding in the first round? Or should the applicant wait until the there is more advancement of the Market Readiness Factors and apply in the other rounds?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC cannot suggest when an applicant should apply. The CEC encourages applicants to reflect on the standing of the technology and the need for funding to advance the technology. There are four rounds of possible funding for applicants, but the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation is awarded on a first-come, first-serve basis. Funds are not set aside for each round. For example, if $30,000,000 is awarded after the first round, and the remainder is awarded in the second round, no more funds will be made available for the third and fourth rounds.

1. **QUESTION:** The BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation funding is issued in a rolling basis, but can the CEC clarify if the budget is $10 million per application round? If not, is there a chance the funding will be depleted after the first round or second round?

**RESPONSE:** There is no set amount of funding dedicated to each funding round. It is possible that all funding will be depleted after the first or second round. Please refer to Question #101.

1. **QUESTION:** Will the remaining budget after each round made public? Where will that updated information be located?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the remaining funds after each solicitation round will be announced with each NOPA. Announcements will be posted here: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2020-07/gfo-20-301-bringing-rapid-innovation-development-green-energy-bridge-2020>

1. **QUESTION:** For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, can an applicant apply for each product with separate funding application in one round? How many separate products applications is allowed per entity per round? What, if any, is the limit? If so, for how many products application per round per entity are allowed?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants may only submit one proposal per solicitation round. If applicants have multiple technologies that qualify for funding, they are encouraged to pick the technology with the most promising technical performance and greatest chance of commercialization.

Please note, applicants that submit a proposal for Round 1 or Round 2 and are not selected may reapply for Round 3 or Round 4. However, they must wait at least one round between proposal submissions.

1. **QUESTION:** Is an applicant limited to separate applications per technology per round?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #104.

## Prior Funding Requirement

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC define what is considered a “project”?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants should be able to describe a “project” to be defined work scoped with project milestones and budget. The project should include a start and stop date that the project work efforts would be completed.

1. **QUESTION:** Based on all the inquires with CalSEED applicants, awardees and ecosystem stakeholders, it is recommended to clarify the question below and avoid confusion for both entrepreneurs and CEC technical scorers:
* On p. 7 of the application, the fourth discussion question is phrased as:

*What technical and commercialization milestones have been realized since the previous CEC or U.S. federal agency awardees completed or near-completion? [...]*

Recommend rephrasing this to adjust for odd grammar and add clarity as follows:

*What technical and commercialization milestones have been realized since the technology innovation components of the previous CEC award (including CalSEED Concept Awards) or U.S. federal agency award have been completed? [...]*

This recommendation in rewording is to clarify what is believed to be the CEC intends for the BRIDGE applicants to demonstrate: progress on technology development or deployment without public sector grant funding support.

Should this reading be inconsistent with the CEC’s intent - and the CEC is expecting at a minimum progress on technology development or deployment with public grant funds awarded for that purpose - recommend to rephrase as:

*What technical and commercialization milestones have been realized since the technology innovation components of the previous CEC award (including CalSEED Concept Awards) or U.S. federal agency award have been awarded? [...]*

**RESPONSE:** The CEC agrees with the recommendation on clarifying the CEC’s intent for BRIDGE applicants’ demonstration of milestones within previous projects. The CEC will include this recommendation in an upcoming addendum to the solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** What are the parameters of the relationship of the previous grant and the technology/project? For example, can a previous natural gas grant qualify if the current project is electric? Or if the previous grant was focus on white paper concept and market research and the current project is TD&D?

**RESPONSE:** The relationship between the previous grant and the proposed technology should be direct and the technology must provide direct benefits to IOU electricity ratepayers. Applicants must provide documentation that the proposed technology has met key technical performance targets under the previous publicly funded award. Applicants are required to submit a Previous Project Evaluation Form (Attachment 14) with the proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the past grant have to be awarded the same technology to have the previous grant qualify this requirement? For example, a company received a previous grant to develop one specific kind of energy storage chemistry, but the company also has slightly different chemistry that is in development that hasn’t received direct grant funding, can the company be eligible to apply if it is seeking to fund the exact same battery storage chemistry that was previously funded by the CEC and/or DOE.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, in instances such as this the applicant must describe in their project narrative how the new technology relates to the originally funded one. For example, does the new technology leverage lessons learned from the original project which prompted changes? Technologies that serve as platforms which can be adapted for multiple applications are also allowed. Please also refer to Question #108.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the CEC have a time limit on the gap between the previous grant and this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** The previously funded project must have been completed within five years of the application due date. If a technology has received multiple grants, the most recently completed one can be used to fulfill this requirement.

1. **QUESTION:** How long ago can the federally funded project be that an applicant uses to satisfy the requirements of section 2A.1? Is a project funded in FY 2015-16 acceptable?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #110.

1. **QUESTION:** If the grant was completed in 2005, can the company still apply?

**RESPONSE:** No, please refer to Question #110.

1. **QUESTION:** How does the CEC want an applicant to show that the prior funding relates to the proposed technology/project? Should the applicant provide a Scope of Work?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants should identify the previously funded project and associated metrics/milestones achieved in Attachment 14. Applicants may also discuss, in the project narrative, how the previous project relates to the current proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** If the applicant was a co-PI or subcontractor on the previous grant, can the applicant still qualify for this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, co-PIs or subcontractors on the previous grant are eligible to apply. Applicants still must be a private, for-profit entity or individual with rights to commercialize the proposed technology. Applicants should clearly explain in their application their role in the previous project and how it relates to their current proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has received funding as a "Subrecipient" via "Pass-Through Entity" as defined by federal law, would the subrecipient meet the eligibility requirements of the BRIDGE Solicitation since the subaward intended to carry out the federal program? The defining feature is that the entity is “passing-through" the monies receive from the grant via a subrecipient to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please refer to Question #114.

1. **QUESTION:** Can concurrent grants qualify as previous awarded grants? For example, if an applicant is currently executing a CEC grant, does the applicant have to wait until the grant is fully closed out before applying?

**RESPONSE:** The previously funded project does not have to be contractually or administratively completed for an applicant to apply to BRIDGE. However, the project must have completed significant milestones that demonstrate the performance of the technology, for example a measurement and verification report, or a draft final report that shows the project results. If the previous project is still early and meaningful results have not been realized yet, it will likely not be a strong candidate for BRIDGE funding.

1. **QUESTION:** Are companies eligible to apply for this grant if the company has an ongoing CEC EPIC grant that is not yet complete and that is still in the early stages of the grant? For example, if a company has an ongoing applied research and development award from the CEC, can the company apply for technology demonstration and deployment funding under GFO-20-301 to fund a grid-connected demonstration project using the same eligible battery storage technology?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #116.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant is currently in progress with a federal grant project, are they still eligible to apply?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #116.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant still apply if the applicant just started with another CEC agreement and have yet to hit any milestones?

**RESPONSE:** Please also refer to Question #116.

1. **QUESTION:** For the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, the CEC mentioned the reviewers will look for progress since federal funding was completed or near-completed. Would an applicant company be eligible for BRIDGE if the company is partly through a DOE SBIR Phase I project with partial technical results from that project? There has also been business progress to note since beginning the SBIR project, notably being admitted to an accelerator program.

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #116.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has never received any grant from CEC, SBIR, DOE or ARPA-E, does that exclude the applicant from applying to this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants must have received previous funding for their technology from a government agency. Please see Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements” in the solicitation manual for the full list of allowable funding agencies. The list includes additional federal agencies beyond the ones identified in this question.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has never applied, or been awarded any CEC grants, including CalSEED and CalTESTBed, can the applicant still apply?

**RESPONSE:** It is not a requirement that applicants be awarded any CEC grants to be eligible. Please refer to Question #121.

1. **QUESTION:** Does an applicant have to be an awardee from the CalSEED or CalTESTBed Program to qualify?

**RESPONSE:** No, an applicant does not have to be an awardee from CalSEED or CalTESTBed to qualify. Please refer to Questions #121.

1. **QUESTION:** Can awardees from CalSEED apply? Can awardees from CalTESTBed apply?

**RESPONSE:** CalSEED awardees may apply for BRIDGE, however if they have not completed their concept award, they must have substantial completion of all requirements (the first three milestones of the CalSEED award). Applicants who have only received a CalTESTBed voucher are not eligible because that program has yet to start any projects.

1. **QUESTION:** Will an applicant be rejected if the CalSEED Concept Award project is not completed prior to the submission deadline?

**RESPONSE:** The previous funding project does not have to be contractually or administratively completed before the application date. However, the project needs to be far enough along that the applicant has results to show. Please refer to Question #116 and Question #124.

1. **QUESTION:** If a company is a CalSEED awardee that has not completed their project, but otherwise meets the other eligibility requirements for BRIDGE (previous state/federal grant + private investment), are they eligible?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #116 and Question #124.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has only received a CalTESTBed award, but no other CEC awards, can that applicant still apply?

**RESPONSE:** No, please refer to Question #124.

1. **QUESTION:** If a company has not been notified if the company was awarded the CalTESTBed award, can the company still apply?

**RESPONSE:** If the CalTESTBed award is the only previous funding for the proposed technology, then the company is not eligible to apply. Please refer to Question #124.

1. **QUESTION:** Is an applicant eligible to apply for funding if the only public funding the company has received would be coming from the 2020 CalTestBed if successful?

**RESPONSE:** No, please refer to Question #124.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has completed an NSF SBIR grant and an in-process EPIC grant, is the applicant eligible to submit with an active EPIC project?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, having completed an NSF SBIR grant meets the applicant eligibility criterion. An active EPIC grant does not disqualify applicants from this solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Do Inclusive Educations Support Program (IESP) grants qualify?

**RESPONSE:** No, IESP grants do not qualify as a prior funding award. Previous funding should be directly connected to the proposed technology. Please refer to Question #108.

1. **QUESTION:** Do natural gas grants qualify? What if the natural gas grant was awarded under CEC?

**RESPONSE:** No, previous funding from natural gas programs – even under the CEC program – will not qualify under this solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Do CEC PIER EISG grants qualify?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, an EISG grant qualifies as a prior funding award, however the project must have been completed within five years of the application due date. Please see response to Question#110.

1. **QUESTION:** Does funding from the DOE American-Made Solar Prize qualify an applicant for the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, applicants should describe what the prize parameters were and how the proposed technology achieved relevant performance metrics associated with the prize competition.

1. **QUESTION:** If a company has received a grant through the Wells Fargo Innovation Incubator (IN^2) program, to validate the technology at the U.S. DOE's National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) and the company owns the IP for the technology, does the company still qualify as an eligible company pursuant to Section II.A.1 of the BRIDGE solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the company is eligible to apply.

1. **QUESTION:** Would a former ARPA-e awardee be eligible, if they did not participate in CalSEED or CalTestBed programs (did not need external lab verification/did not fit technology calls)?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, an award from ARPA-e, which is part of the U.S. Department of Energy, qualifies as a prior award. Being an awardee of the CalSEED or CalTestBed programs is not a requirement for applicants.

1. **QUESTION:** Does being awarded the CEC's "Production Scale-Up for Clean Energy Technologies" contract in 2019 disqualify applicants from BRIDGE?

**RESPONSE:** No, it would not disqualify applicants, but the BRIDGE proposal would need to be for a different technology product than the one they received an award for from the aforementioned solicitation. In addition, the “Production Scale-Up for Clean Energy Technologies” award cannot be used to fulfill the previous funding requirement since that funding opportunity was focused on manufacturing and will not reflect technical milestones for continued technology development that is required for BRIDGE.

1. **QUESTION:** Do SCALEUP awards from 2019 with a previous CalSEED award qualify?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Please refer to Question #136.

1. **QUESTION:** If a company has multiple previous grants and current grants for a technology, what grant should the company highlight or account for to the CEC or should all grants be accounted for? For example, if a company is in the middle of a federal grant and has just started a CEC grant that has no specific results yet, should the company just mention the federal grant? Is it a disadvantage to mention the grant with little to no progress yet?

**RESPONSE:** For the purpose of completing Attachment 14, applicants should provide information from the most relevant and recent grant that shows the technology achieving key technical milestones and performance targets. Applicants may mention more recent grant funding in the project narrative to indicate continued support for the technology.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has worked on a pilot project with a California Utility before, but the proposed application will be more related to the applicant’s previous funded project than the California Utility project, which previous grant should the applicant provide information about to the CEC in order to qualify?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants should provide information on both grants in the project narrative but highlight information from the grant that has more application to the proposed project. For purposes of Attachment 14, the applicant should complete this information from the previous grant that has more application to the proposed project under this solicitation. Please refer to Question #108.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant was awarded an NSF SBIR and received both Phase I and Phase II funding and separately developed the original core IP during a CEC-funded grant, would one or both of these previous awards allow the applicant to be eligible for this grant?

**RESPONSE:** Both of this previous funding grants will qualify.

1. **QUESTION:** Since the completion of CalSEED concept awards are potentially a “make or break” criteria for BRIDGE 2020 awards, and have three recommendations pertaining to the eligibility criteria:
	1. It should be clarified that the requirements listed under the heading “Additional applicant eligibility requirements and considerations” do not apply concurrently.
	2. Completion of the CalSEED concept award should be defined.

To address these two items, it is recommended to rephrase the first two bullets under “Additional applicant eligibility requirements and considerations” as follows:

* *Projects must have previously received a funding award directly from one of the following CEC or U.S. federal agencies funding electricity research:*
	+ *California Energy Commission’s Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) electric program;*
	+ *California Energy Commission’s Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) program (excluding CalSEED);*
	+ *U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)*
	+ *U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA);*
	+ *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;*
	+ *National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA);*
	+ *National Science Foundation (NSF);*
	+ *U.S. National Institute of Health (NIH)*
* *Alternatively, projects that do not meet the funding requirement listed above but have substantially completed all requirements for their CalSEED concept award are eligible for this solicitation. Substantial completion of all requirements means that the first three milestones of the CalSEED award have been completed by the awardee and have been submitted to the contractor implementing the CalSEED program as of the deadline date for each BRIDGE 2020 application round.*
* *Applicants whose projects received funding for their previous research while being developed at an academic institution, national laboratory, or non-profit research organization are eligible as long as the core intellectual property currently resides with the applicant; and the applicant can demonstrate a path forward for commercializing the technology in California.*
	1. Aligned with the previous item, it is strongly recommending that the CEC team, in dialogue with the CalSEED CAM, reach out to New Energy Nexus team when the scoring starts for each round to get the most up-to-date status of CalSEED concept awards for the intent and purpose of the BRIDGE 2020 application.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC agrees with the recommendation on defining completion of CalSEED awards to qualify for the BRIDGE solicitation. The CEC will include this recommendation in an upcoming addendum to the solicitation.

Regarding the recommendation on coordination between the CEC and the CalSEED administrator – it is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the applicant has sufficiently completed its project prior to submitting an application for BRIDGE.

## Previous Project Evaluation Form

1. **QUESTION**: Can the CEC clarify the process/steps need to complete the Previous Project Evaluation Form?

**RESPONSE:** Section I asks the applicant to fill out basic project and contact information about the applicant and the previously funded project.

Under Section II applicants may list up to five performance metrics that were achieved as part of the previously funded project. If the previously funded project is complete and there is a publicly available report documenting the project results, please include that report either as a URL link or as an attachment.

If the previous project is not complete but there are milestone reports available, please attach those reports. Please remember to not include any confidential information in any document submitted to the CEC.

If documentation of performance metrics is available, please include the completed Attachment 14 with the rest of your proposal.

If the previously funded project is not complete or there is not any report available report to cite, please send the form to an authorized representative of the previous funding agency. The funding agency representative will need to fill out Section IV, validating the stated performance metrics.

If agency representative validation is required, the representative must submit the completed Attachment 14 to bridge@energy.ca.gov prior to the application due date.

An addendum to the solicitation attachment will be made to include clarified instructions.

1. **QUESTION:** If verification is needed by the government project manager, does the applicant obtain the email and submit a copy as part of the application, or does the applicant need to ask the government project manager to send an email directly to the bridge@energy.ca.gov email?

**RESPONSE:** If verification is needed by the previous funding agency, the authorized representative must directly send the completed Attachment 14 to bridge@energy.ca.gov prior to the application submission deadline. Please also see response to Question #143.

1. **QUESTION:** For BRIDGE, what is the deadline for submitting the Previous Project Performance document to CEC, and then what is the deadline for CEC to receive the response from the previous funding agency?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question #143

1. **QUESTION:** For “demonstrated success”, should the applicant reference only completed projects or also highlight progress on current projects in filling the Previous Project Evaluation Form?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants should include results from all projects that are relevant to their current proposal. Applicants may submit multiple copies of the Previous Project Evaluation Form (Attachment 14), presenting the results of different projects if they wish. Please see response to Question #143 for differences in requirements between citing projects with available reports and projects that do not have reports available.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has multiple grants from eligible federal agencies; should the applicant submit a Previous Project Evaluation Form (Attachment 14) for each awarded grant?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants may submit multiple Previous Project Evaluation Forms if they wish to highlight multiple projects that have received previous funding. Please refer to Question #146.

1. **QUESTION:** The solicitation asks the applicant to provide evaluation information of past Federal awards. For example, if an applicant was awarded an ARPA-E award in 2013 with the period of performance 2014 to 2015. The ARPA-E Program Director at that time has moved on from ARPA-E. What information would the CEC like from ARPA-E or the applicant to fulfill this requirement?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question #143. For completed projects, please include the final report or other publicly available information that supports the stated performance metrics either as a URL link or as an attachment.

1. **QUESTION:** Does there need to be a signature on Previous Performance if the grant was awarded a long time ago?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question #143. For completed projects, please include a URL link or as an attachment relevant project reports that validate the stated performance metrics.

1. **QUESTION:** For the Previous Performance Form, does the applicant have to provide documentation that they met key technical performance targets under their previous publicly funded award?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question #143.

## Applicant Eligibility

1. **QUESTION:** Can the Prime applicant, who has received a previous grant, work through partnerships with utilities or other prior CEC Recipients?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, as long as the Prime applicant is a for-profit commercial entity (or individual) with rights to the intellectual property being advanced under the proposed project. Applicants can have utilities and other CEC Recipients as subcontractors.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant submit one application for multiple groups?

**RESPONSE:** No, applicants may not submit a single application to multiple groups. Applicants may only submit one application per solicitation round. Please see response to Question #104.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant have multiple projects (i.e. technology deployments) proposed in a single application?

**RESPONSE:** No, each application may address only one technology topic. Additionally, applicants may submit only one application per solicitation round.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the CEC recommend submitting two applications if an applicant have two different technologies of the same family, but with different objectives?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question #104 and #152.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant enter more than one technology? For example, Battery and, in a separate application, ceramic semiconductor substitutes for Cobalt, Lithium, Nickel, and / or Neodymium & Neodymium batteries? If an applicant can, and both were accepted, would the applicant have to choose one to apply the award to, or would the CEC choose based on total points?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Questions #104 and #152.

1. **QUESTION:** Has any applicant who has not been awarded from the CalSEED or CalTESTBed Program been successful with the BRIDGE Program?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, several companies that have not been awarded a CalSEED award or CalTestBed voucher have received funding from previous BRIDGE solicitations.

## Project Eligibility

1. **QUESTION:** How does the CEC define Low income or Disadvantaged Communities? What are the parameters? What other definitions outside of the CalEnviroscreen v3 can be applied? Is there additional funding for these project or considerations in scoring?

**RESPONSE:** For the purposes of these solicitations, the CEC defines these terms as:

Low-income Communities are defined as communities within census tracts with median household incomes at or below 80 percent of the statewide median income or the applicable low-income threshold listed in the state income limits updated by the Department of Housing and Community Development. Parameters are explained in this link: <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits.shtml>

Disadvantaged Communities are defined as communities in the top 25% scoring areas from CalEnviroScreen along with other areas with high amounts of pollution and low populations. Parameters are explained in this link: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-30>

There is additional funding of up to $500,000 available within the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation for TD&D projects. Both solicitations give preference points to proposed projects that demonstrate benefits to disadvantaged and/or low-income communities. Please refer to Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring” for more information.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a proposed Technology Demonstration project, validating a technology advancement, be layered onto an existing CEC-funded energy efficiency project, providing distinct, additional capabilities and overall performance benefits reductions?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, however the tasks presented in the proposal to BRIDGE or RAMP should be distinct and contain no overlap with the existing CEC-funded project.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant include both “Applied R&D” and “Technology Demonstration and Deployment” portions in the same application, or does the CEC recommend submitting two applications (one for R&D and the other for demonstrations)?

**RESPONSE:** An applicant’s proposal can include both AR&D and TD&D elements into a single project as long as both elements are for the same technology. Projects that include aspects of TD&D must address the TD&D questions in the Project Narrative.

1. **QUESTION:** Should part c. of ‘Technical Merit’ in Attachment 3 essentially be a summary of Attachment 11, or is there a desired difference? If there is a difference, please clarify with examples.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the Technical Merit, part c section of the Project Narrative Form should be consistent with Attachment 11 – the Project Performance Metrics. The Project Narrative allows more narrative discussion on the target performance metrics and how the project plans to achieve those targets. Please also ensure that responses are provided to all other questions identified in Section I.C of each solicitation manual.

1. **QUESTION:** If an application is applying with a co-applicant as a subcontractor (i.e., a National Lab or University in California), is there a minimum required percent of work that must be done by the lead applicant vs. co-applicant?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC has no minimum requirement of work that must be done by subcontractors (co-applicants) versus Prime applicants (lead). The amount of time required for a subcontractor work on the project is up to the Prime applicant. For this solicitation, there is only one entity/individual that should be Prime applicant. The Prime applicant should fall under the eligible list in Section II.A. of the solicitation manual. Please note, National Labs and public/private universities are not eligible as Prime applicants for this solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Can CEC funds be used for direct labor and travel of staff located outside of California? For example, the CEO of the company is located in Canada but will be an active actor in the project, will CEC funds cover this staff member? If not, can this cost be counted as Match Funds?

**RESPONSE:** CEC funds can be used for direct labor and travel for staff located outside of California. However, applicants who do spend CEC funds outside of California will score lower on their proposals as one of the scoring criteria is “Funds Spent in California.” Please see Section IV.F “Stage Two: Application Scoring” for more information. CEC encourages applicants to use match funds for these expenses and activities. Applicants shall adhere to travel restrictions of using state funds to travel to certain other states pursuant to AB 1887 (2016) and codified at California Government Code Section 11139.8. A current list of states subject to travel restrictions can be found at the Attorney General’s website http://oag.ca.gov/ab1887.

1. **QUESTION:** Are certification costs of a product (UL and Energy Star) eligible for these programs?

**RESPONSE:** Certification costs can be part of an applicant’s tech transfer plan. The applicant should discuss in their proposal how this will lead commercialization of their technology.

# RAMP SOLICITATION SPECIFIC

## Funding

1. **QUESTION:** What is the minimum and maximum funding for this solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** For the GFO-20-302, RAMP 2020 Solicitation there is up to $15,069,250 available for grants awarded. The minimum funding amount for each project is $1,000,000 and the maximum funding amount is $3,000,000. There is a match funding requirement of at least 50% of the grant funds requested. Please refer to Section I.D. “Funding” of the solicitation manual.

Please also note that additional points may be awarded to applications that exceed the minimum match requirements. Please refer to Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring” for complete details.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the RAMP 2020 Solicitation have multiple funding rounds? If not, why does this solicitation not have rounds?

**RESPONSE:** The RAMP 2020 Solicitation does not have multiple application rounds. The sole deadline to submit applications is November 20, 2020 by 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time. Please refer to Section I.E. “Key Activities Schedule” for more details on activities, dates, and times for this solicitation. There is less funding available for the RAMP 2020 Solicitation as compared to the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation, which is why there is only one funding round.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC clarify how match funds are calculated? For example, if an applicant has a qualified federal grant totaling $1M and are 50% through the federal grant at the time of applying for RAMP (e.g. $500K spent, $500K still available to be spent), would the full federal project be counted as match funding (e.g. $1M) or just the remaining available funding (e.g. $500k)?

**RESPONSE:** Match funding must be spent during the term of the agreement. In the example provided, only the remaining available funding of $500,000 may be claimed as match as long as the application indicates that $500,000 will be spent during the term of the grant agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** Can matching funding come from project finance?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, however applicants must have possession of the funds at the time of application. Contingent or future funds that have not been secured by the applicant are not eligible forms of match funding.

1. **QUESTION:** What is the minimum and maximum funding for each energy category?

**RESPONSE:** There is no allotted amount set per technology topic/category for this solicitation. The highest scored proposals will be awarded. For RAMP, the minimum funding amount is $1,000,000 and the maximum funding amount is $3,000,000 regardless of technology topic/category.

1. **QUESTION:** Out of $15M, what is the amount allocated to Group 4 (Advanced Power Electronics and Power Conditioning)?

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #168.

## Types of Manufacturing

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant manufacture outside California and still be eligible?

**RESPONSE:** No, any direct manufacturing activities and any pilot production lines that are established as a result of activities funded under this solicitation must be located in California. Please refer to Section 1.C. “Project Focus” in the solicitation manual.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the manufacturing for RAMP have to take place in California, or just the implementation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please refer to Question #170. Also note, impacts and benefits to California IOU ratepayers as well as Funds Spent in California are scored criteria for all proposals- see Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring”, scoring criteria 3 and 6.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an otherwise eligible company for RAMP apply if it has a manufacturing line outside the country but wants to bring production to CA, would that company still eligible for RAMP funding?

**RESPONSE:** No. The purpose of RAMP is to support companies in their transition from one-off prototype development to low-rate initial production. Relocating an existing manufacturing line from outside to inside California does not fit this intent.

1. **QUESTION:** Does an applicant have to propose a project that is completely in-house manufacturing, or can some aspects of the manufacturing be outsourced?

**RESPONSE:** Either is acceptable for the RAMP solicitation. Final assembly including the pilot production line needs to be located in California.

1. **QUESTION:** In the RAMP 2020 Solicitation, Section 1.C. insinuates the applicant to show a path to commercialization in California. If design is in California, can a portion of manufacturing be done outside the USA? Is there a limit to the percentage of value added outside California?

**RESPONSE:** Any direct manufacturing activities and any pilot production lines that are established as a result of activities funded under RAMP must be located in California. Please refer to Question #173.

1. **QUESTION:** Can an applicant do component manufacturing for an eligible technology? For example, if an applicant currently outsources manufacturing of a key component from overseas, can the RAMP funding be used to develop a tailored manufacturing for this component with a manufacturing partner in CA?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, manufacturing key components of eligible clean energy technologies is acceptable as long as the technology is one of the eligible technology topics or energy applications. Applicants should describe in their proposal if they are selling the component to an OEM or Tier 1 supplier or if the component will be used in their own product. Please refer to Section I.C. “Project Focus” for the complete list of eligible technology topics or energy applications. CEC will include this description in an upcoming addendum.

1. **QUESTION:** Can RAMP funds be used to support the manufacturing of individual components in an eligible battery storage system?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please refer to Question #175.

1. **QUESTION:** Would a bio electrochemical treatment technology still qualify for the project if some of the components are not manufactured in California, but the cathode manufacturing is? The cathode is proposed to scale up during the project and will be manufactured in California.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, please refer to Question #175.

## Applicant Eligibility

1. **QUESTION:** It looks like the GFO-20-301 BRIDGE Solicitation is only for companies that have that have previously received funding from an eligible CEC program or United States federal agency; Can any applicant apply for the GFO-302 RAMP Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants do not have to have previously received funding from an eligible CEC program or United States federal agency to qualify for the RAMP solicitation. Please refer to Section II.A “Applicant Requirements” for complete details regarding eligibility requirements for RAMP.

1. **QUESTION:** Will an applicant to GFO-20-302 RAMP 2020 Solicitation be rejected if the applicant has not completed the CalSEED Concept Award project prior to the RAMP application submission deadline?

**RESPONSE:** No, completing a CalSEED Concept Award prior to the RAMP 2020 Solicitation application deadline is not a requirement for RAMP applicants. Applicants should only apply if the proposed technology is ready to transition from one-off prototypes to the low-rate initial production stage. This solicitation is not for technology development and validation. Please refer to Section II.A “Applicant Requirements” for completed details regarding eligibility requirements for RAMP.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant was not selected for CalSEED or CalTESTBed, is the applicant still eligible to apply to the RAMP program?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Please refer to Question #179.

1. **QUESTION:** Can sub-contracted supply chain manufacturers also submit a bid separately to this solicitation? For example, metal fabricators.

**RESPONSE:** Applicants that apply to the RAMP solicitation must be a for-profit commercial entity or an individual with rights and intentions to commercialize the proposed technology. Assuming the supply chain manufacturer does not have such rights, it would not be eligible to apply to the RAMP solicitation. Supply chain manufacturers are encouraged to partner with eligible applicants to create a successful project. Applicants and potential project partners can connect on EmpowerInnovation.net.

1. **QUESTION:** Considering a proposed technology may fall into more than one category, can the applicant choose all applicable categories? Or should the applicant choose what they think is the best match? Does it count against the applicant if the CEC feels the technology does not belong in the original energy category, but a different one?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants may apply to only one technology topic/category. It is up to the applicant to choose which technology topic/category best encompasses the technology and its intent. The CEC will not count it against the applicant if the CEC feels the technology is listed under the wrong category.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the CEC recommend submitting two applications if we have two different technologies of the same family, but with different objectives?

**RESPONSE:** For BRIDGE 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal per application round. For RAMP 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a company have multiple projects (i.e. technology deployments) proposed in a single application?

**RESPONSE:** No, please refer to Question #182.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a company enter more than one technology? E.G. Battery and, in a separate application, ceramic semiconductor substitutes for Cobalt, Lithium, Nickel, and/or Neodymium & Neodymium batteries? If the company can, and both technologies were accepted, would the company be able to both project? Will the company have to choose one of the award or would the CEC choose based on total points?

**RESPONSE:** For BRIDGE 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal per application round. For RAMP 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal.

1. **QUESTION:** If the RAMP solicitation currently appears to overlap substantially with an applicant’s current grant, would that make the applicant ineligible? If the applicant applies with a similar, but distinct technology - for example, with a “Version 2” of the technology or with a different stage of manufacturing to reach a certain units per year – Can the applicant still apply?

**RESPONSE:** The applicant would be eligible as long as the technology and project scope is separate and distinctly different from the current grant. It is up to the applicant to provide information on the differences and steps to get the technology to a MRL8 by the agreement end date. Applicants should also explain how leveraging the existing progress of the current grant will build a successful project if awarded.

## Existing Companies

1. **QUESTION:** If the applicant is an existing established company, but have a new technology geared for energy efficiency, is the applicant eligible?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, as long as there is not an existing production line for the new product/technology and the applicant meets the other eligibility requirements listed in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements”. The RAMP solicitation is for companies without established production lines for the associated technology.

1. **QUESTION:** The GFO discusses startups as being the focal area to receive these funds. If a viable commercial stage company were building out a new line for a eligible technology on the list, would that company be eligible or is there some criteria or definition of startup that would exclude sort of a later stage company from applying?

**RESPONSE:** That company would be eligible as long as there is not an existing production line for the new product/technology and the applicant meets the eligibility requirements listed in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements”. Please refer to Question #187.

1. **QUESTION:** For RAMP, can an applicant that has existing manufacturing capability for one product apply for RAMP to build manufacturing capability for an entirely distinct new early stage product?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, that company would be eligible as long as there is not an existing production line for the new product/technology and the applicant meets the eligibility requirements listed in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements”. Please refer to Question #187.

## Project Eligibility

1. **QUESTION:** For RAMP, does the technology need to be at LRIP stage at the time of the application, or is it acceptable to have an already-funded, in-process, activity under way to achieve this in a timeline compatible to allow a successful RAMP project activity?

**RESPONSE:** The technology does not need to be at the low-rate initial production (LRIP) stage at the time of the application. The technology does need to be at the LRIP stage by the time the grant agreement ends. Applicants should describe in their proposal their plan for reaching the LRIP stage and potentially beyond by the end of the grant agreement.

1. **QUESTION:** In the RAMP 2020 Solicitation, it states low-rate initial production as a goal; Is there an upper limit on production capacity to develop within RAMP funding?

**RESPONSE:** No, there is no upper limit on production capacity since this will vary depending on the technology.

1. **QUESTION:** If application is completed with a co-applicant (i.e., a National Lab or University in California), is there a minimum required percent of work that must be done by the lead vs. co-applicant?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC has no minimum requirement of work that must be done by subcontractors (co-applicants) versus Prime applicants (lead). The amount of time required for a subcontractor work on the project is up to the Prime applicant. For this solicitation, there is only one entity/individual that should be Prime applicant. The Prime applicant must meet the eligibility requirements listed in Section II.A. “Applicant Requirements”, of the solicitation manual. Please note, National Labs and public/private universities are not eligible as Prime applicants for the RAMP solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** If the project is for scaling up manufacturing of a system component, does the component have to be a demonstration unit operating in the field? The technology has already demonstrated the technology multiple times, so should the applicant include demonstration in the proposal or strictly focus to scale manufacturing?

**RESPONSE:** The applicant should strictly focus on scaling manufacturing. If additional field demonstrations are required, applicants are encouraged to apply to BRIDGE instead. If the proposal is focusing on a specific component of a larger system, please be sure to describe in the proposal the performance of the overall system, how the component fits in to the overall system, and what are the particular challenges facing the specific component that requires RAMP funding to support. CEC staff will include this description in an upcoming addendum.

1. **QUESTION:** In some case, the equipment required for production is not available from US suppliers, so companies have to purchase some equipment from foreign vendors. Is this acceptable to do during the project with CEC funds? If not, can equipment be purchased with match funding?

**RESPONSE:** Purchasing equipment with CEC funds from foreign vendors is allowed; however, purchasing equipment from foreign vendors with match funding is encouraged as there are no disposition requirements at the end of the agreement for such equipment. Typically, grant Recipients may continue to use equipment purchased with CEC funds if the use is consistent with the intent of the original agreement.

Additionally, please note that CEC funds spent to purchase equipment from vendors outside of California will result in a lower score for the Funds Spent in California scoring criterion. See Section IV.F. “Stage Two: Application Scoring”, scoring criterion 6.

1. **QUESTION:** Equipment is inherently very expensive; what is the budget for equipment per project? If equipment is bought with match funds, will the CEC look more favorably on that project?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC has no set minimum or maximum budget requirement for equipment. Please refer to Question #194 for the second part of the question.

1. **QUESTION:** Would it be beneficial for the proposal to provide support letters from current and/or potential customers who will benefit from scaling up the technology, but do not necessarily provide funding or a test side for the project?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC strongly encourages applicants to include letters of support from current and/or potential customers if their proposal. Please see Attachment 10 – Commitment and Support Letters Form for more details about commitment and support letters.

1. **QUESTION:** Can RAMP funds be used to improve production process and screening to address markets with higher reliability requirement?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, however the process improvement must be related to an eligible technology topic. See Section I.C. “Project Focus” for the full list of eligible technology topics.

1. **QUESTION:** Can RAMP program funds be utilized for product certification, as a necessary step in development of production readiness?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC does not prohibit RAMP funds being used in this capacity, but the applicant will need to clearly explain in the proposal why and how product certification is directly connected to production scale-up.

# TECHNOLOGY ELIGIBILITY

1. **QUESTION:** What are the specific technology areas that are being funded by these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Both solicitations will cover technologies under energy efficiency, energy storage, artificial intelligence/machine learning/advanced sensing, advanced power electronics/power conditioning and zero- and negative-carbon emission generation. Please refer to Section 1.C. in both solicitations to see the complete list of eligible technology topics.

1. **QUESTION:** How strict are the categories for the BRIDGE and RAMP technologies? In other words, if there is a closely adjacent technology to the category, is there a chance it will be considered? Will the CEC be flexible and included other technologies not listed?

**RESPONSE:** The applicant must demonstrate in the proposal how their technology fits within one of the eligible technology topics. More importantly, applicants need to be able to articulate in their proposal how the proposed technology will provide benefits to electric ratepayers in California’s investor-owned utility service territories. Both solicitations were updated with an addendum on August 18, 2020 which expanded the list of eligible technologies.

Please note, the RAMP 2020 Solicitation is on production-scale up which inherently refers to physical technology products that are manufactured. Software-based technology, and software-only innovations are not eligible for this solicitation.

1. **QUESTION:** Are technology topics not listed in the BRIDGE project focus table still eligible, if they fit within the Group theme? For example, solar energy conversion that does not use emerging thin film solar PV materials.

**RESPONSE:** Please refer to Question #199 and Question#200.

1. **QUESTION:** For Requirements for Technology, where can the public find specific parameters/criteria that define the type of technology? Example: “Storage as part of mobile microgrid” or defining “Ultra-Fast” or “High-Efficiency”?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC considers a minimum power level of 400 kW to qualify as ultra-fast charging. For other terms, there are not specific parameters – the applicant should describe in their proposal how their technology compares to commercially available state-of-the-art incumbents.

1. **QUESTION:** What are the guidelines for categorization of a technology which fits in two project focus categories?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants must decide the which technology group and eligible technology topic best fits their proposed technology. The CEC does not count it against the applicant if the CEC feels the technology is listed under the wrong category.

1. **QUESTION:** What happens if a technology/project satisfies the criteria for two or more categories/topic areas (e.g. energy storage + advanced power electronics or AI + renewable generation)? Is the technology/project eligible for separate awards for each category/topic area?

**RESPONSE:** Applicants must choose a single eligible technology topic to apply under per proposal. A single proposal will not be awarded multiple awards under these solicitations. Applicants are encouraged to identify the category being advanced the most with their technology and apply to that one. Please refer to Question #203.

1. **QUESTION:** Our company has two separate projects that would qualify under Group 2 - Energy Storage and Group 3 - Machine Learning, respectively. Would it be acceptable to submit two distinct proposals? If so, does the CEC have any specific recommendations or guidance to increase the likelihood of both projects being funded?

**RESPONSE:** For BRIDGE 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal per application round. For RAMP 2020, applicants may submit only one proposal.

## Energy Efficiency

1. **QUESTION:** Are there any quantitative metrics for wastewater treatment under the energy efficiency category that are not included in the solicitation, but the CEC would like to see in the proposal?

**RESPONSE:** There are no specific quantitative metrics identified in the solicitation. Applicants should identify the most relevant metrics for their technology and describe how they plan to meet their targets.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC addendum the Energy Efficiency category to include "Agriculture Irrigation & Filtration". Agriculture is one of the largest energy consuming industries in California and the highest energy draw is for pumping water. As more acres are converted to "pressurized irrigation", currently about 7 million acres in California, it is crucial that operating pressures are as low as possible since there is a direct correlation between pressure and pumping energy consumption. It is important to understand that all pressurized irrigation must utilize some form of filtration and this is the area where developments of new technologies have fallen behind. Successful development and implementation of "low pressure filtration" in Agriculture Irrigation systems would have great positive impacts on; Energy Consumption, Environmental & Climate Concerns, Disadvantaged Communities, and Food Supply.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Efficiency.

1. **QUESTION:** Would a bio electrochemical treatment technology system, that are energy- and carbon- neutral technology for onsite wastewater treatment of high strength industrial wastewater that no other technology can treat, qualify under the Energy Efficient category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Efficiency.

1. **QUESTION:** A technology that use wastewater and salty water to convert to distillated water could classify for the Energy Efficient category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this would qualify under wastewater treatment.

1. **QUESTION:** Does Storm-Water LID Retrofit or Cement Water treatment qualify under the Energy Efficient category?

**RESPONSE:** These technologies could qualify under wastewater treatment. Applications should describe how their technology results in energy savings and benefits to electric IOU ratepayers.

## Energy Storage

1. **QUESTION:** Can “Thermal Storage” be added to Group 2: Energy Storage for the BRIDGE Solicitation? Thermal Storage is included in the RAMP solicitation under the Energy Storage category and based on the stated purpose of the BRIDGE solicitation, Thermal Storage is good fit for BRIDGE as well. Thermal storage can contribute to grid reliability, resiliency and safety, pairs well with renewable energy sources, offers peak load-shifting, can contribute to building efficiency, and some thermal storage technologies can provide benefits particularly to disadvantaged and low-income communities.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a technology that provides thermal storage in conjunction with advanced electric heat pumps qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Will the CEC accept projects that are about thermal energy for heating water or generating low quality steam?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC modify of the solicitations to include mechanical and thermal storage technologies under Group 2: Energy Storage?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Can gravity-based energy storage technologies qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Do fuel cell as a hydrogen fueled power generator that can be an enabler for green hydrogen for long duration energy storage (including technologies such as electrolyzers) qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Li-ion cells: Cells that are significantly safer and eliminate thermal runaway reactions, preventing fires and increasing safety which is critical for the future of Li-ion grid storage. In addition, these cells would have ~10% higher energy, and work at a much broader temperature range. The solicitations did not call out Li-ion technologies, would this qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Can a company that is working on cathode materials of lithium-ion and lithium-metal batteries qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Super-Capacitors: capacitors that feature ~25% higher energy, use a safer electrolyte, a wider temperature window, without sacrificing life or power from the state-of-practice. I am unaware of where CEC's interest lies with super capacitors; would our technology be a fair fit for this proposal? Would this technology qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Zn metal batteries: Zn metal chemistry which would be a much lower $/kWh solution for grid storage than Li-ion systems and much safer. Though the Zn-metal cells would not be applicable to EVs or other high Wh/kg applications, it would be a good fit for grid-storage solutions where mass of the system is a lower concern. Would this technology qualify under the Energy Storage category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Are wind turbine technologies covered under these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** No, wind turbine technologies are not eligible technologies under these solicitations.

1. **QUESTION:** Under the Energy Storage category, can CEC please provide some examples of so-called "enabling technologies" for lithium sulfur and lithium metal batteries?

**RESPONSE:** Example technologies include, but are not limited to, battery cells or subcomponents such as separators, membranes, or electrolytes that can be applied to lithium sulfur or lithium metal batteries.

1. **QUESTION:** The proposed technology solution is an enabling technology for solar and lithium-metal batteries and falls under Group 2: Energy Storage of the Solicitation, Section I.C. The applicant has developed a patented panel-level energy storage solution that can fit under any industry standard solar module, neatly integrating with the solar racking array. The technology features advanced thermal management to maintain an optimal working temperature even under extreme outdoor conditions. The unique architecture also helps address grid outages by enhancing grid resilience and reliability. And, perhaps most importantly, the streamlined and modular design allows for a much lower total cost of installation for rooftop solar plus storage projects than any other current energy storage systems. Would this technology be a good fit for the Energy Storage for the Applied Research & Development and the Technology Demonstration & Deployment of the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this technology qualifies under the Energy Storage category.

1. **QUESTION:** Our technology has not been covered under the current Energy Storage topics for the upcoming BRIDGE grant, but we would like to propose the additional category of "Improvements to Lithium-Ion Battery manufacturing" as an addendum topic.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Will the start-up company working on the lithium-ion battery materials development be eligible for BRIDGE program?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** The proposed technology uses a green-chemistry synthetic solution that simplifies manufacturing and enhances the overall quality of high-Ni NMC cathodes. The cathodes are cost-effective solutions for next-generation, high-performance lithium-ion batteries. The proprietary cathode technology has four advantages: 1) unique one-pot simplifies the process to incorporate lithium into the transition metal into precursors; 2) lower capital cost and higher production rates; 3) direct and simple recycling of mother liquor after liquid-phase reaction; 4) lower energy costs due to efficient calcination, and 5) competitive performance in batteries using the cathode products. Currently, the technology is scaling the process and optimizing the process using the electrochemistry of batteries incorporating our high-Ni NMC cathodes. We plan to accelerate the large-scale production and performance testing to support the commercialization of our cathode technology with support from the BRIDGE funding.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Unfortunately, while reviewing the applicable Solicitation Manual, CESA noted that Group 2 – Energy Storage currently only includes a limited selection of energy storage technologies.

CESA considers the exclusion of a diverse set of energy storage solutions within this solicitation improper, as it limits the impact BRIDGE 2020 could have in broadening the set of available resources to reach California’s energy and climate targets. Considering the ambitious goals set forth by the Legislature within bills such as Senate Bill (“SB”) 100, CESA considers it fundamental to explore and support all assets that could potentially contribute to the State’s decarbonization efforts. Moreover, CESA would like to highlight that regulatory agencies within the State have noted the need for further diversification of the storage portfolio ahead of 2030. Within its Integrated Resource Planning (“IRP”) proceeding, the California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) has identified the need for about 9 GW of battery storage and 1 GW of long-duration storage by 2030. These results highlight the growing need for distinct energy storage resources. By furthering the decarbonization of the electric grid, energy storage assets provide ratepayer benefits and enable the State to meet its overarching energy goals, thus meeting the requirements of the Electric Program Investment Charge Program (“EPIC”). As such, CESA respectfully requests the CEC revise the definition of Group 2 within GFO-20-301.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC has issued an addendum to both solicitations expanding the list of eligible technologies, including storage technologies.

1. **QUESTION:** Does the CEC assign rating points for battery technologies that are essentially holy grail of batteries?

**RESPONSE:** A technologies potential for innovation and performance are evaluated under the Technical Merit section of the scoring criteria. Please see Section IV of each solicitation manual for more information about how proposals are evaluated.

1. **QUESTION:** Please add, "Compressed Air Energy Storage (CAES) system" as competitive to batteries for energy storage?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC modify to include pumped-storage hydro power or hydroelectric energy storage?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Energy Storage.

## Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advanced Sensing

1. **QUESTION:** Regarding BRIDGE: If an applicant has a microgrid with AI-driven smart charging for EVs, where the solar, EV, storage and building are all managed by an AI system, does this qualify under the "Virtual Power Plants" under the Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Sensing section?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this technology would qualify for the BRIDGE solicitation under the “Virtual Power Plant” technology topic.

1. **QUESTION:** BRIDGE: Does assessing the impact of weather on EV grid load and predicting risk of overloading the electricity generation grid using Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning fall under the AI/ML/sensing section?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this technology would qualify for the BRIDGE solicitation under the “Climate and Weather Risk Prediction to electric infrastructure and services” technology topic.

1. **QUESTION:** The proposed project will be developing software to minimize total cost of operation and risks in fleet electrification especially medium and heavy-duty fleets. The unique nature of the solution is the joint modeling of transportation and energy. The software is aimed at organizations engaged in planning and operation of electric fleets. Technology is based on mathematical optimization, simulation and machine learning. There is no EV related topics under the “Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advanced Sensing” for TD&D under the BRIDGE 2020 Solicitation. Is this technology eligible?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to the BRIDGE solicitations to include this technology. This technology is would qualify under “Advanced Sensors and Diagnostics”.

1. **QUESTION:** Could a controls software solution be considered an “Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advanced Sensing” technology or “Energy Efficiency” or either?

**RESPONSE:** If the innovation is primarily a software innovation, it would more closely align with the Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advance Sensing group.

1. **QUESTION:** Does demand management qualify under Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advanced Sensing?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, demand management could qualify either as part of Building Automation or Virtual Power Plants.

1. **QUESTION:** Can the CEC modify the Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning/Advanced Sensing to include Diagnostic technologies? The proposed technology is considered an enabling technology for batteries - either as an advanced diagnostic tool or as a more proactive battery management system. The value is being able to improve the life cycle and enable the circular economy through better testing for repurposing batteries. It can be used across different types of batteries as well including hydrogen, but we've primarily tested with lithium-ion as that's the leader in energy storage and electric vehicles.

**RESPONSE:** The CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include diagnostics as an eligible technology topic.

## Power Electronics/Power Conditioning

1. **QUESTION:** For the ultra-fast electric transportation charging category, will inductive wireless power transfer technologies be considered? Or are only conductive charge mechanisms preferred?

**RESPONSE:** Either form of charging is eligible under the Advanced Power Electronics/Power Conditioning technology area.

1. **QUESTION:** For the ultra-fast charging category, is there a minimum power or charge rate?

**RESPONSE:** The CEC considers a minimum power level of 400 kW to qualify as ultra-fast charging.

1. **QUESTION:** Does CEC have any power ratings or efficiency ratings for terms used in Power Electronics category, such as “high-efficiency” or “ultra-fast” or “high-power”?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question#238.

1. **QUESTION:** Under the advanced power electronics/power conditioning category, what does CEC consider to be "ultrafast" charging speeds in the context of light duty versus medium duty/heavy duty vehicles?

**RESPONSE:** Please see response to Question#238.

1. **QUESTION:** For this category, will non-passenger EV applications be considered? For example, would ultra-fast charging for medium- and heavy-duty EVs, robotics, drones, or micro-mobility (e.g. scooters, bikes) be considered?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the charging applications identified here are eligible.

1. **QUESTION:** Group 4 includes Advanced Power Electronics/Wide Bandgap Semiconductor Device. Does this extend to power electronic modules? A power electronic module contains several power semiconductor devices, which are typically soldered or sintered on a substrate. Compared to discrete power semiconductor devices, power modules provide higher power density and are in many cases more reliable in the application

**RESPONSE:** Yes, power electronic modules would fall under Group 4 for both BRIDGE and RAMP.

1. **QUESTION:** BRIDGE: In Advanced Power Electronics, does ultra-fast charging refer to charging hardware or software? Does an AI-driven fast charging system qualify?

**RESPONSE:** An AI-driven fast charging system would qualify under Group 4: Advanced Power Electronics/Power Conditioning

1. **QUESTION:** Clarification regarding BRIDGE Group 4, Solid-state distribution system components (transformers, inverters, circuit breakers) - Is this focused on utility grid distribution, or on-vehicle power distribution?

**RESPONSE:** Both utility grid distribution and on-vehicle power distribution, as well as DER applications such as onsite and grid-scale storage would be eligible under Group 4.

1. **QUESTION:** In the Joint Workshop Presentation, the presenters referred to wide bandgap semiconductor device as part of Group 4: Advanced Power Electronics/Power Conditioning. Can funding be devoted to semiconductor foundry process and device technology development for wide bandgap device components that go into power electronics?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, this would be considered eligible under Solid-state distribution system components for Group 4.

## Zero- & Negative- Carbon Generation

1. **QUESTION:** Are thermophotovoltaics eligible under Group/Category 5: Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emissions Generation, and if not, can this technology be added to the list of eligible technologies?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.

1. **QUESTION:** Would a project focus in Group 5 (Zero- and Negative-carbon emission generation) with a technology topic of hybrid solar converters be responsive to this funding opportunity? Specifically, the solar cogeneration of electricity and high temperature heat using an actively tracked system; the technology was developed under ARPA-E's FOCUS program.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.

1. **QUESTION:** The proposed technology is a first-of-its kind pressure recovery valve, which integrates pressure control and energy generation in a standardized and modular unit. This technology produces low cost, constant and reliable zero-carbon emission electricity. Would this technology be eligible as zero-carbon technology the will qualifies for funding in the Group 5: Zero- and Negative- Carbon Emission Generation category?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.

1. **QUESTION:** If an applicant has invented a new form of hydropower energy generation, will the CEC consider is eligible under these solicitations?

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.

1. **QUESTION:** The proposed technology recycles Carbon Dioxide into valuable chemical products, using renewable electricity as an input. Does this fit under Energy Storage because it is a way to effectively store energy in molecules (e.g. fuels, chemicals or does it fit under Zero- and Negative- Carbon Emission Generation because it is upcycling Carbon Dioxide into new products (and therefore enabling neutral emissions?

**RESPONSE:** As described, this technology seems to fit better under Zero- and Negative- Carbon Emission Generation

1. **QUESTION:** Would concentrated solar power (CSP) if used as a heat source supporting electricity production be an eligible technology? For example, there are several CSP applications with geothermal facilities that can improve geothermal electricity production capabilities.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.

1. **QUESTION:** Does a hybrid photovoltaic thermal hybrid solar plus storage cogeneration system best fit under Energy Efficiency, Energy Storage or Zero- and Negative- Carbon Emission Generation?

**RESPONSE:** The applicant will need to decide where the core innovation of their technology lies and decide which technology group its best fits under.

1. **QUESTION:** Does CEC have interest in combined heat and power (CHP) at the residential or commercial scale for either BRIDGE or RAMP? It's long been known that CHP can be the most efficient use of natural gas, since it can use the waste heat otherwise lost in generating electricity from natural gas, while natural gas has decarbonized the US grid more each year over the past decade than solar and wind combined. Can CHP using solid-state energy technologies be listed under Group 5: Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation, which can be very interesting for the CHP application? Compared to the state of the art in heat pumps (i.e. fitting under "Enabling technologies for advanced electric heat pumps" in Group 1: Energy Efficiency), more money can be saved and with comparable, if not even better, Carbon Dioxide reduction within the same appliance. Technologies for this CHP application could appear to fit under with Group 5, since technologies are listed there, or Group 1, since the application is improving energy and carbon efficiency relative to the grid.

**RESPONSE:** Fossil fuel CHP systems are not supported as part of the EPIC program.

1. **QUESTION:** Will the CEC modify to include demonstrated a pressure-reducing turbine technology in the hydroelectric space to the technology list? In a past CEC EPIC project, this technology has been successful and would like to take that same concept and apply it to a bioenergy project.

**RESPONSE:** Yes, the CEC issued an addendum to both solicitations to include this technology. This technology is included under Zero- and Negative-Carbon Emission Generation.