**Questions and Answers Document**

**Disclaimer**: The following answers are based on California Energy Commission (CEC) staff’s interpretation of the questions received during the pre-application workshops and those submitted in writing prior to the deadline of October 31, 2024. It is the Applicant’s responsibility to review the purpose of the solicitation and to determine whether their proposed project is eligible for funding by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements within the Solicitation Manual. The CEC cannot advise as to whether a particular project is eligible for funding because not all application details are known.

**Project Research Goals and Baselines**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Q1***  | *On page 25/54 in Table 1, the "Research Goals for Group 1" state, "Reduce energy consumption/intensity of the capture process of the DAC approach " - is this meant solely for the capture portion of the process and not the desorption?* |
| **A1**  | No, the goal includes both the capture and release of carbon dioxide.  |
| **Q2**  | *Does the 2032 goal of $100/Mton include CO2 capture only or include transportation, sequestration, and costs of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) services?*  |
| **A2**  | The goal of $100 per metric ton (MT) carbon dioxide (CO2) equivalent by 2032 is a market-wide goal established by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) through their Carbon Negative Shot, and projects funded through this GFO should aim to meet this target, though not necessarily within the term of the proposed project. The goal includes CO2 capture and storage costs at gigaton scale. Please see [the DOE Carbon Negative Shot document](https://www.energy.gov/fecm/carbon-negative-shot?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery) for details.  |
| **Q3**  | *Does the 1KTA CO2/year removed need to be demonstrated at the site, or can the proposed scope be in support of building larger scale direct air capture (DAC) facilities?*  |
| **A3**  | Group 2 projects must demonstrate the target of 1000 MT CO2/year at the project site by the end of the project term. For details, please review the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B.  |
| **Q4**  | *Can you explain more about the $100/Mton include CO2 capture? What is included in that number?*  |
| **A4**  | Please see the response to Q2.  |
| **Q5**  | *Can you specify more clearly what constitutes the boundaries of the DAC “system” for which the Baseline cost and energy are applied? Is compression energy/cost included in the Baseline energy consumption requirement?*  |
| **A5**  | The DAC system consists of both CO2 capture and release steps. Any post-conditioning, including the compression of the captured CO2, is not included in the baseline requirements for this GFO. Please also refer to the responses to Q1 and Q2.  |
| **Q6**  | *With the focus on air capture and not on sequestration/storage, does the $100/MT apply to just the capture stage?*  |
| **A6**  | Please see the response to Q2.  |
| **Q7**  | *The subject solicitation mentions a baseline of 2500 kWh/MT of CO2 as energy consumption/intensity of the capture process of the DAC approach on page 28. Can you please tell us what is the source of this baseline estimate and what all is included in this number?*  |
| **A7**  | Project metrics in the Solicitation Manual reflect the CEC staff's current market assessment. The energy baseline value(s) - presented in Table 1 and Table 2 - include(s) the total of electricity and thermal energy. Please also review the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. Project Requirements.  |
| **Q8**  | *Can a co-product be used to reduce overall cost of DAC?*  |
| **A8**  | The proposed project should primarily focus on advancements in DAC technology. If the captured CO2 is utilized in producing a value-added product that decreases both the costs of capturing and releasing CO2, the sale of this co-product could help reduce the overall net cost of DAC. However, the proposed project must align with the Solicitation Manual's goals. Please also refer to the response to Q2.  |
| **Q9**  | *If an awarded project's technology is commissioned and captures 300 MT CO2/year, but we can show evidence that we can capture 1000 MT CO2/year by end of agreement, would CEC continue to fund this project? Or does the technology have to capture 1000 MT CO2/year during the demonstration?*  |
| **A9**  | Project metrics outlined in the Solicitation Manual must be demonstrated by the end of the project term, which concludes on March 30, 2030. For more information, please review the Solicitation Manual Section II.B, Project Requirements.  |

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q10**  | *From the guidance, the site needs to be secured and a letter of support provided by the land owner/partner and CEQA completed. Does this mean that, should a site need to be leased, the DAC company needs to make that commitment in the application stage ahead of knowing if we would be awarded a grant?*  |
| **A10**  | The project site does not need to be leased to the recipient or project partners at the time of application; however, a letter of commitment (not just a letter of support) from the site owner must be included in the application package to confirm the site's availability. Additionally, the project team should address the following points in the Project Narrative:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | (1) availability of the required infrastructure, (2) familiarity with permitting requirements and timeframes, and (3) potential backup sites. The applicant must organize the application in a way that minimizes the time needed for the CEC to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). All CEQArelated information should be provided to the CEC promptly to ensure the agency can complete its review by the encumbrance deadline. The CEC reserves the right to cancel the proposed award if it determines, at its sole discretion, that the CEQA review for the proposed project is unlikely to be completed before the encumbrance deadline. For additional information, please refer to Section I.I of the Solicitation Manual.  |
| **Q11**  | *Please clarify the CEQA process as it relates to projects developed as part of Group 2; specifically, do we have to have completed CEQA before we would receive grant funding from the state?*  |
| **A11**  | CEQA must be completed before the CEC’s Business Meeting to consider approval of the grant, which also needs to be before the encumbrance deadline of the funds. The applicant must organize the application to minimize the time the CEC needs to comply with CEQA requirements. All CEQA-related information should be submitted promptly to ensure timely review before the encumbrance deadline. The CEC reserves the right to cancel the proposed award if it determines, at its sole discretion, that the CEQA review for the proposed project is unlikely to be completed before the encumbrance deadline. For more information, refer to the response to Q10 and Section I.I of the Solicitation Manual.  |
| **Q12**  | Are indoor/lab-scale projects subject to CEQA?  |
| **A12**  | Applicants must include the CEQA form in their application package. The CEQA Lead Agency determines whether an indoor/lab-scale project is a project subject to CEQA and whether CEQA exemptions may apply. Note that while lab-scale projects are frequently exempt from CEQA, the bidders for these projects are still required to submit the CEQA form.  |
| **Q13**  | *Does CEQA gate project kickoff?*  |
| **A13**  | We believe this is asking whether CEQA requirements need to be met by the time of the project kickoff meeting. The project kickoff can take place only after the project receives approval at a CEC Business Meeting. The CEQA process must be fully completed prior to the project's approval at the business meeting. If the applicant is unable to complete this process prior to the business meeting, the CEC reserves the right to cancel the proposed award.  |
| **Q14**  | *Please clarify the CEQA process as it relates to projects developed as part of this grant; specifically, do we have to have completed CEQA before we would receive grant funding from the state?*  |
| **A14**  | The applicant must organize the application to expedite the CEC compliance with CEQA requirements. All CEQA-related information must be provided promptly to ensure the  |
|  | CEC can complete its review by the encumbrance deadline. The CEC reserves the right to cancel the proposed award if it determines that the CEQA review is unlikely to be finished on time. For more details, refer to the responses to Q10 and Q11 and Section I.I of the Solicitation Manual.  |

**Scope and Eligibility**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q15**  | *Can you explain the restrictions on working with oil companies for Group 2 projects? Is there just a restriction on doing enhanced oil recovery (EOR), or will CEC not fund projects that have anything to do with an oil company?*  |
| **A15**  | Assembly Bill (AB) 209 (Chapter 251, Statutes of 2021) established the CRISP program to support the development of DAC technologies. The statute clearly states that projects funded through this program are not allowed to benefit any petroleum or gas production, processing, or refining facilities.  |
| **Q16**  | *Is this financial support available for DAC that directly removes CO2 from the atmosphere through a biological process? Does this qualify as a process that is both physical and chemical? Is eligibility in this GFO available for enhanced nature-based CO2 Removal DAC technology that benefits agriculture with the use of the CO2 captured directly from atmosphere via bio-sequestration of the CO2 (as described by California Air Resources Board (CARB) in its Scoping Plan) with increased food production (crop yields) from agricultural crops. Does food production qualify as "manufacture of a clean chemical" per DAC definition? Does increased biomass production as a sustainable and renewable and "clean low-carbon fuel" (based on life cycle) qualify also per the DAC definition?*  |
| **A16**  | The Solicitation Manual, Section I.A., states that this GFO aims to advance DAC technologies that remove carbon dioxide (CO2) through physical and/or chemical processes. Biological processes, like bio-sequestration, are not eligible. Please refer to Q8 for more details on co-products.  |
| **Q17**  | *Are DAC to efuels or other conversion of carbon to products eligible, or are storage/sequestration applications preferred?*  |
| **A17**  | While applicants, particularly those in Group 2, are required to provide post-carbon management plans, the primary focus of this GFO is on advancing DAC systems and processes in California. Proposed projects should concentrate on innovations in DAC technology. If the captured CO2 is used in producing a value-added product (like efuel) that reduces both the costs of capturing and releasing CO2, the sale of this co-product could help lower the overall net cost of DAC. However, projects must align with the goals outlined in the Solicitation Manual. Additionally, please refer to the responses to Q2 and Q8 for more information.  |
| **Q18**  | *If chosen for Group 1 and we demonstrate the ability to advance to at least TRL 6, will there be funds to move to Group 2 or equivalent new and timely DAC solicitations?*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A18**  | This GFO is a standalone funding opportunity. Projects in Group 1 cannot receive additional funds from Group 2, even if there are overlapping achievements. Any funding needed to further advance the technology after the agreement period must be requested through a future relevant GFO. Each project must follow the guidelines in the solicitation manual for its designated group.  |
| **Q19**  | *Can we use CEC funds for DAC + CO2 conversion to a useful product?*  |
| **A19**  | CRISP and this GFO aim to financially support the advancement of DAC technologies, emphasizing cost reduction and improved efficiency of CO2 removal. While DAC can be part of broader carbon transformation initiatives, this GFO focuses specifically on DAC advancements. If captured CO2 utilization is included, it must align with the goals in the Solicitation Manual.  |
| **Q20**  | *Can an oil company submit for funding if the Direct Air Capture technology that captures CO2 directly from the atmosphere does not benefit oil and gas production and does not involve geologic storage, but instead manufactures clean, low-carbon fuels and chemicals? Can the manufacture be solely a clean low-carbon chemical and still qualify as DAC?*  |
| **A20**  | An oil and gas company can apply for this GFO with a DAC project that removes CO2 directly from the atmosphere. However, the application must clearly demonstrate that there are no direct or indirect benefits to oil and gas production. Additionally, it must meet all the requirements outlined in the Solicitation Manual. Please see the response to Q15.  |
| **Q21**  | *Is there a benefit to having multiple companies go in together on a single application?*  |
| **A21**  | Multiple companies can submit a joint application, which may enhance capabilities depending on their collaboration. The primary benefit arises from the synergy created through working together. If the collaboration allows for the pooling of complementary skills, knowledge, or technologies to address specific challenges in developing and demonstrating DAC technologies, it could significantly increase the project's potential impact and success. However, if the collaborators do not provide substantial value through their combined expertise, the advantages may be limited.  |
| **Q22**  | *If we seek Group 1 funding but achieve Group 2 goals prior to end of project dates, can we access additional CEC funding?*  |
| **A22**  | No, each project must adhere strictly to the guidelines and funding structures established in the Solicitation Manual for its designated group. If the project is categorized under Group 1, it is not eligible to receive additional funds associated with Group 2 goals, regardless of any overlaps in achievements.  |
| **Q23**  | *Would CARB-approved emission control systems for oceangoing vessels qualify for this grant? This is a barge-based unit that captures the exhaust directly from vessels, processes the exhaust, and has zero waste.*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A23**  | No, this is considered a point source and is not eligible for DAC technology funding in this GFO.  |
| **Q24**  | *By setting goals in terms of cost and energy for CO2 capture to CO2 regeneration, CEC is limiting the offerings to carbon capture and storage, CCS. There are ways where instead of regenerating CO2, which has high energetic cost, a useful product can be directly produced thus closing the carbon cycle and reducing reliance on fossil fuels, for example fertilizer, synthetic fuels, carbon fiber, etc. It may not be possible to break down the CO2 capture/regeneration cost in these cases from the overall process. Can we propose a process that does not require CO2 regeneration? How will that fit with the CEC matrix?*  |
| **A24**  | The goal of this GFO is to support projects focusing on enhancing the efficiency of both chemical and mechanical methods for capturing atmospheric CO2. While the disposal or conversion of the captured CO2 is an important aspect that should be addressed in the application, it is not the primary focus of this solicitation.  |
| **Q25**  | *We are a startup pioneer in a low-energy DAC driven by waste streams from bioindustries. We are incorporated in Canada and are looking for opportunities to gain access to the US market. I am wondering if we are eligible to apply for the GFO-24-303 Grant. Thank you for your time and consideration.*  |
| **A25**  | All applicants and their project partners must be registered and in good standing with the California Secretary of State to be awarded funding. Please see Section II.A.3 of the Solicitation Manual for more information, as well as scoring criterion 6, CEC Funds Spent in California, in Section IV.F. Note that this GFO targets chemical and mechanical capture of atmospheric CO2; biological processes are not eligible.  |
| **Q26**  | *Are there restrictions for eligible expenses related to operational expenses (i.e., transportation of feedstock for DAC technology testing)?*  |
| **A26**  | Operational expenses must comply with the requirements outlined in Section III.C.6, Budget Forms (Attachment 6), in the Solicitation Manual. Please review Section II.A.3 of the Solicitation Manual for more information, as well as scoring criterion 6 in Section IV.F (CEC Funds Spent in California), the [terms and conditions,](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/CRISP_Standard_Exhibit_C_Terms_ada.pdf) and the budget forms, for any additional restrictions and requirements.  |
| **Q27**  | *Is crop carbon enrichment an eligible Direct Air Capture technology, as suggested by the reference in the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (see page 94, reference 161, where greenhouse gas fertilization is mentioned as the 3rd largest DAC technology at 900 T/Y)?*  |
| **A27**  | No, crop carbon enrichment is not an eligible DAC technology for this GFO, as the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan covers various activities, while the CRISP program focuses specifically on DAC technologies. Please refer to Q16 for more information.  |
|  **Site Location and Community Benefits Requirements** |
| **Q28**  | *What is meant that the demonstration site must be within the same community/area as the supporting organization (the CEC, the company building the project)? Is this based on the company’s home office?*  |
| **A28**  | This requirement stipulates that to justify the benefits of a project to a specific local community, the application must meet the following conditions: (1) the demonstration site must be located within that community, and (2) the application package must include a letter of support from an organization that represents or provides services to that community. It is important to note that this requirement applies to the demonstration site, not to the DAC technology developer office. Please also review the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B, Project Requirements.  |
| **Q29**  | *Can the demonstration site be a factory campus that emits CO2 from a point source, while the technology is still capturing CO2 directly from air?*  |
| **A29**  | Demonstration sites may be located within an industrial facility and could potentially be co-located with a point source capture site. However, the entire proposed project must focus on advancing DAC technology. Projects centered on point source capture are not eligible for this GFO.  |
| **Q30**  | *Does the 1KTA CO2/year net removed need to be demonstrated at the awarded project site, or can the proposed scope be in support of building larger scale DAC facilities that may or may not be built in California (e.g., testing done as part of this project in California is meant to help scale and de-risk the technology but not necessarily to expand the facility at the awarded project site)?*  |
| **A30**  | Yes, the 1,000 tons of CO2 emissions per year must be demonstrated at a site located in California. Please refer to the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B, Project Requirements. Additionally, projects that maximize the expenditure of the CEC funds within California will earn points as detailed in the corresponding table (please review the "Funds Spent in California" scoring criterion in Section IV.F of the Solicitation Manual for more information).  |

**Intellectual Properties**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q31**  | *How does the CEC plan to keep intellectual property from a Group 1 grant confidential? The application itself will be publicly available, but we're sensitive about the results of the actual research done as part of the grant.*  |
| **A31**  | The CEC will only disclose Confidential Recipient Information under the circumstances specified in Title 20 CCR Sections 2506, 2507, and 2508. All Confidential Recipient Information that is disclosed by the Recipient or any other entity will become a public  |
|  | record and will no longer be subject to the CEC’s confidentiality designation. Please review Section 18 of [the CEC CRISP Standard Grant Term](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/CRISP_Standard_Exhibit_C_Terms_ada.pdf) for details. The CEC encourages applicants to structure their proposed projects in a way that would meet the requirements and goals of the solicitation without requiring the submittal of any confidential information. If needed, a grant recipient may propose that a particular “Product” as defined in the [terms and conditions](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/CRISP_Standard_Exhibit_C_Terms_ada.pdf) (e.g., a deliverable report or memo to the CEC under the grant) be submitted in both a confidential and a non-confidential version. In this way, the general results of the research or project may be made publicly available by the CEC, while proprietary results may be protected under the CEC’s confidential information regulations. However, please note that such split Product submissions are subject to the Commission Agreement Manager (CAM) approval.  |
| **Q32**  | *How does the state of California plan to keep intellectual property from an R&D grant confidential? The application itself will be publicly available we understand, but we're sensitive about the results of the actual research done as part of the grant.*  |
| **A32**  | The CEC will only disclose Confidential Recipient Information under the circumstances specified in Title 20 CCR Sections 2506, 2507, and 2508. All Confidential Recipient Information that is disclosed by the Recipient or any other entity will become a public record and will no longer be subject to the CEC’s confidentiality designation. Please review Section 18 of [the CEC CRISP Standard Grant Term](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/CRISP_Standard_Exhibit_C_Terms_ada.pdf) for details. Please see the response to Q31 for more information.  |

**Number of Applications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q33**  | *Can one company submit two applications, one for Group 1 and one for Group 2?*  |
| **A33**  | Yes, applicants may be awarded funds for two different projects submitted to two different groups (such as Group 1 and Group 2). However, the proposed projects must be separate and distinct. Please see Section IV.E of the Solicitation Manual, Screening Criteria, for more details.  |
| **Q34**  | *Can multiple Group 1 applications be sent for same technology without overlapping scope, meaning at different sites?*  |
| **A34**  | An applicant can submit multiple applications and receive multiple awards. However, each application must meet the following criteria: 1. It must be for a separate and distinct project, meaning there should be no overlap in the technical approaches, nor any overlap in the tasks and products/deliverables detailed in the Scope of Work.
2. It should address only one of the eligible purposes outlined in the Solicitation Manual, specifically in Sections I.C. (Project Focus) and II.B. (Project Requirements).
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 3. It must adhere to all the requirements specified in this solicitation.  |
| **Q35**  | *Can an organization apply for multiple CEC grants for projects based at the same site, with different scope(s)?*  |
| **A35**  | Yes, an organization can apply for multiple CEC grants for projects based at the same site. Note that the applicant must provide context and justify that the scopes and budgets of these projects are different and do not overlap. Also, no previously awarded CEC funds can be used as match funding for the current application. Please see the response to Q34.  |
| **Q36**  | *Can Group 1 and Group 2 applications be submitted for same technology with overlapping scope, meaning a willingness by client to provide matching funds to increase scale for proven higher TRL effort completed by 2032 after 1-2 year (by 2025/6) of performance at the lower TRL group 1 project?*  |
| **A36**  | While an entity can submit separate projects for both groups, applications for each group must be distinct in terms of their scope and technical tasks. If both applications target the same technology and have overlapping project scopes, it will not align with the requirement that each application must pertain to a distinct project. This would be particularly relevant if both projects are based on using the outcomes from a Group 1 project (at a lower TRL) to inform a Group 2 project, as overlap in technical tasks is not allowed. Also, while the willingness of the client to provide matching funds for a proven higher TRL effort may be considered advantageous, it would still not override the fundamental requirement that the scope of each project must differ. Please see the response to Q33.  |
| **Q37**  | *It was commented on, but to clarify, can Group 1 applications and Group 2 applications be submitted by the same company for the same site location, growing the DAC project by TRL and size?*  |
| **A37**  | Please see the response to Q36.  |
| **Q38**  | *Can an organization submit applications to both Group 1 and Group 2 for the two projects to be located at the same site in California? To give more context, the Group 1 pilot project would be our generation 2 technology at a TRL-4-5 level, where the Group 2 project would be our generation 1 technology at the TRL-6 with the goal to advance both technologies. Is it possible for one organization to be awarded two awards, a Group 1 and a Group 2 award?*  |
| **A38**  | Please see the response to Q36.  |
| **Q39**  | *Just double checking that we can apply both for a Group 1 (R&D) and Group 2 (Demos & Community Engagement) Grant? We understand that we have to submit a separate application for each, but we do have the possibility of winning both at the same time, correct?*  |
| **A39**  | Please see the responses to Q33 and Q36.  |

**Potential Bonus Points**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q40**  | *Is there credit for the lowest $/Ton and/or the highest Mt/Year facility?*  |
| **A40**  | To appropriately address this question, more specific information/context is needed. Please review the Solicitation Manual, Section II.B. Project Requirements and the scoring criteria presented in Section IV. F. These sections provide context on the requirements for each group and how preference points may be allocated based on specific metrics, including cost and capacity.  |
| **Q41**  | *We understand that Group 1 does not have a minimum cost sharing/match requirement. We are wondering if any additional points would be awarded if we provide cost sharing in the proposal. And if so, would the percentage above minimum (bottom table on Page 52 of the manual) be calculated with respect to the total commission funding requested?*  |
| **A41**  | Yes. The match funding requirement is based on the percentage of match funding committed above the minimum match requirement compared to the amount of the CEC funds requested. For example, for Group 1, if an applicant requests $1,000,000 from the CEC and commits $400,000, then the application would have 40% above the minimum match requirement and would receive 3 points for the match fund preference points. For Group 2, however, there is a 20% minimum match requirement. So, if an applicant requests $2,000,000 under Group 2 and provides $1,000,000 in match, for example, the application would have 30% above the minimum match requirement (($1,000,000-(0.2 x $2,000,000)) ÷ $2,000,000 = 30%) and would receive 2 points. Additional preference points are awarded based on the percentage of committed match that is cash versus in-kind. Please see the Match Funds scoring criterion in Section IV.F of the Solicitation Manual for more information.  |
| **Q42**  | *On page 52, Preference Points table part b, a formula is given for points awarded for cost share above the minimum, as a fraction of the minimum cost share. The cost share minimum for Group 1 proposals is zero, making the published formula invalid. Can you please clarify how Preference Points will be calculated for Group 1 proposals with cash or in-kind cost share?*  |
| **A42**  | Please see the response to Q41.  |
| **Q43**  | *Since Group 1 is not required to provide any match funding, how will match funding, if provided, be scored? Will providing match funding for Group 1 be awarded preference points? Is there an advantage in terms of scoring for providing match funding if submitting a proposal under Group 1?*  |
| **A43**  | Please see the response to Q41.  |

**General/Administrative/Uncategorized**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q44**  | *Are interested applicants able to meet with the CEC to ask about individual use case/project eligibility?*  |
| **A44**  | No, as a state agency, the CEC has a responsibility to share information equitably with all potential applicants, ensuring equal treatment. Therefore, the CEC uses this Q&A process to make equal information accessible to all applicants.  |
| **Q45**  | *If we send you detailed questions - could you not publicly release the details?*  |
| **A45**  | No, as the state agency, the CEC has a responsibility to share information equitably with all potential applicants, ensuring equal treatment. Therefore, the CEC has set up a formal process in which potential applicants can ask their questions prior to the submission deadline. The questions and answers will then be posted on the program webpage, making this information accessible to everyone.  |
| **Q46**  | *When can we expect the answers for these questions?*  |
| **A46**  | We anticipate posting the Questions and Answers in the Week of November 18, 2024.  |
| **Q47**  | *Is there strong coordination between CEC and DOE on DAC?*  |
| **A47**  | The CEC shares common interests with DOE in improving the performance of DAC technologies. Please review the Solicitation Manual, Section I. for more information. To the extent that an awarded project aligns with future cost-sharing opportunities with other entities (public or private), such as DOE’s expected Regional DAC Hub funding announcement, it may leverage the CEC award to expand its scope or enhance its impact. If any necessary adjustments to the project scope, budget, or both are warranted after selection by the CEC to align with DOE funding opportunity announcement requirements, such changes may be requested. The CEC may approve such changes after review. Please note that this GFO and CRISP are separate from DOE's DAC funding opportunities.  |
| **Q48**  | Is there a strong coordination between California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) and CEC for this grant?  |
| **A48**  | CDFA is not an active partner in this GFO focused on DAC technologies.  |
| **Q49**  | *Is there a strong coordination between CDFA and CEC for this grant? Executive Order N-20-82 requires coordination of capture by CEC and CDFA.*  |
| **A49**  | Please see the response to Q48.  |
| **Q50**  | *We understand the page limits for each section, but are drawings and images allowed to be included? And if yes, do they count for the page limits?*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A50**  | Pictures are allowed in Project Narrative, Project Team, and Project Performance Metrics if needed. They count towards the page limit.  |
| **Q51**  | *In the executive summary form, attachment 1, what is meant by or needed for "Agreement management description" section?*  |
| **A51**  | The Agreement management description should describe how the project team (including subcontractors) will coordinate work on project tasks, use resources, and address risks to ensure the goals and objectives of the project are achieved.  |
| **Q52**  | *In the executive summary, "Project task list description," since these are elaborated in the scope of work, is this meant to be a list or an actual detailed description? Also, the executive summary is limited to 2 pages.*  |
| **A52**  | "Project task description" in the executive summary provides a brief overview of project tasks described in detail in the Project Narrative.  |
| **Q53**  | *Are project terms stipulated by the applicant, by the state, or is that negotiated as part of the award?*  |
| **A53**  | No, the project terms and conditions are set by the CEC and state legal requirements and are not negotiable. Please check the CRISP [terms and conditions](https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-10/CRISP_Standard_Exhibit_C_Terms_ada.pdf) and Solicitation Manual for details.  |
| **Q54**  | *What is the acceptable duration of the projects?*  |
| **A54**  | The project duration must not exceed 58 months. The awarded projects are anticipated to start 45 days after the March 2025 Business Meeting. The agreement end date cannot exceed March 30, 2030. Please check the Solicitation Manual, Section I.E, Key activity schedule.  |
| **Q55**  | *if chosen for funding, can we begin work immediately after the March business meeting and be reimbursed when CEC funding is available?*  |
| **A55**  | No, the recipient must wait until the agreement is fully executed and signed by all parties before starting any project activities. Expenses incurred before that date will not be reimbursed.  |
| **Q56**  | *Is it possible to backdate expenses for ongoing projects?*  |
| **A56**  | No, invoices for any expenses incurred prior to the execution of the agreement will not be accepted for reimbursement. Therefore, no work can commence until the formal agreement is in place.  |
| **Q57**  | *Does the funding have an expiration?*  |
| **A57**  | Yes, the funding expiration date is June 30, 2030. However, we require project activities to be completed by March 31, 2030, so that final invoicing and payment occur before the funds liquidate.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Q58**  | *Based on the proposed schedule, when are we able to start charging expenses toward this grant? Is it technically May 2025 (45 days after the March business meeting)?*  |
| **A58**  | The recipient must wait until all parties fully execute the agreement before starting any project activities. 45 days after the business meeting is an approximate timeline for when an agreement is expected to be executed, though this is subject to change depending on the nature of the projects and agreement requirements. Invoices for any expenses incurred prior to the execution of the agreement will not be accepted for reimbursement. Therefore, no work can commence until the formal agreement is in place.  |
| **Q59**  | *Since DAC technology is fairly new and expertise is limited, will there be an opportunity for reviewers and applicants to discuss certain proposal details as part of the review process in order to support reviewers and their understanding of the proposed technologies?*  |
| **A59**  | No, as a state agency, the CEC has a responsibility to share information equitably with all potential applicants, ensuring equal treatment. The CEC does not meet with prospective applicants prior to the application due date since the solicitation is competitive. The CEC has set up a rigorous review process for the applications, and no support from private parties is necessary.  |
| **Q60**  | *It would be helpful to know who our audience is. Can the CEC provide brief program specific bios/credentials - looking for relevant skillset/experience, not names/dates - of the reviewers?*  |
| **A60**  | The evaluation process, from application receipt to the posting of the Notice of Proposed Awards (NOPA), is confidential; therefore, CEC will not release biographical or credential information about the scoring team during the proposal-writing and proposal-evaluation processes.  |
| **Q61**  | *Can those who are fortunate enough to receive NOPAs for this GFO, begin work immediately after appropriate CEC agreements are signed but funds are not yet available for funding?*  |
| **A61**  | No, the recipient must wait until all parties fully execute the agreement before starting any project activities. Please see the response to Q55.  |
| **Q62**  | *Will a list of today's attendees be provided?*  |
| **A62**  | No, the workshop attendee list will not be posted. However, interested parties can find partners for this GFO by becoming members to Empower Innovation at <https://www.empowerinnovation.net/>and clicking “Find a Partner” at the top of the page [https://www.empowerinnovation.net/en/custom/funding/view/44964.](https://www.empowerinnovation.net/en/custom/funding/view/44964)  |
| **Q63**  | *Please explain the ineligible technology note "direct ocean capture" - if capture is in the air but sequestration is in the ocean, is that eligible?*  |
| **A63**  | CRISP and this GFO are focused on supporting the advancement of DAC technologies, with an emphasis on lowering costs and increasing the efficiency of CO2 removal  |
|  | processes. While DAC technologies can be integrated into broader carbon management and sequestration efforts, the focus of this GFO is not on the sequestration of captured CO2. If the proposed project focuses on DAC technology advancements with some element of storing captured CO2,  The applicant will need to ensure that it aligns with the outlined goals explicitly stated in the Solicitation Manual.  |