

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF QUESTIONS

I. Frequently Asked Questions:	1
A. If I have questions about this funding announcement, who do I contact?	1
B. How will I receive a response to questions submitted to arpa-e-co@hq.doe.gov about this FOA?	1
C. Will ARPA-E post a response to every question submitted to arpa-e-co@hq.doe.gov ?	1
D. If I have questions about ARPA-E exchange, who do I contact?	1
E. Can I speak or meet with the ARPA-E program director or other ARPA-E personnel about this funding opportunity announcement?.....	1
F. Can a person be PI on one proposal and a Co-PI on a second separate proposal?.....	2
G. May applicants submit more than one concept paper to this funding opportunity?.....	2
H. I have developed a technology that may be a good fit for this funding opportunity. Will ARPA-E please review my idea and let me know if it is responsive to this FOA?	2
I. Are foreign entities eligible to apply to this FOA?	2
J. Are individuals eligible to apply to this FOA?	2
K. Are we required to register for the Teaming List for this FOA?	2
L. I missed the last Concept Paper deadline. Can I still submit a Full Application?	2
M. Our project team includes several team members. Does each team member need to contribute cost share equally?.....	3
N. Can you tell me whether my project team qualifies for reduced cost share?	3
O. Will in-kind contributions count towards meeting our cost share requirements?.....	3
P. We have a question concerning the impact of a large business seeking patent rights under a class waiver if our team qualifies for reduced cost share of 10%. Does this mean the entire team project is subject to 20% cost share or only the large business' portion of the project will be subject to 20% cost share?.....	3
Q. Can you tell us whether our project team qualifies for reduced cost share based on the following scenario: []?.....	3
R. How should we include references in our Full Application? Do they count towards the overall page limitation for the Technical Volume?	4
S. Our team originally submitted a Concept Paper that listed [organization name 1] as the Prime Recipient. For our Full Application, can we change the lead organization to **** [organization name 2] instead?	4
T. Can I include new Co-PIs and/or sub-recipients in my Full Application?	4
U. My Concept Paper was encouraged. What are my chances of being selected for award negotiations by ARPA-E?.....	4
V. Do sub-recipients also need to fill out the Business Assurances & Disclosures Form or is this filled out only by the Prime Recipient?	4
II. Questions for week ending: October 3, 2014	4

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF QUESTIONS

Q1. There is a submission deadline discrepancy between FOA-0001197 cover page “November 10, 2014” and FOA page 1 “November 3, 2014”. Please confirm Concept Paper Submission Deadline is November 10, 2014.	4
Q2. Can ARPA-E make their LCOE model available for public use? Where can we find it?	4
Q3. What are the assumptions and methodologies for their LCOE model?	5
Q4. Is the cost of \$50/kW for insulation cost plus material or component cost only? Does it include operation cost? If it does, what are the key assumptions of electricity cost/kWhr and other assumptions?	5
Q5. We have developed a **** and would like to know if our technology will qualify for ARID funding? Our technology involves an ****. Would this type of solution qualify for ARID consideration?	5
III. Questions for week ending: October 10, 2014	5
Q6. A. Would technologies that lead to significant reduction in water loss (> 75% reduction in water loss, compared to present day cooling towers), and have other significant benefits, be considered non-responsive, or are such solutions acceptable to ARPA-E?	5
Q14.B The same enabling technology can significantly benefit the steam condenser and result in compact, lightweight, low maintenance condensers. Would it be acceptable to propose technology development that affects steam condensers to reduce water losses substantially?	6
Q15. Is the "COP _{cool} " metric (COP _{cool} > 2 on page 23) for a single-effect sorption system or will multi-effect systems that meet this metric be considered?	6
Q16. I have a question in regards to submission of Concept Papers for the ARID FOA. Can ideas on both Category 1 & 2 be proposed in a single Concept Paper or will such a submission be considered non-responsive? In other words, if we have ideas for both Category 1 and 2 (that may provide an integrated solution) should we submit two Concept Papers?	6
IV. Questions for week ending: October 17, 2014	6
Q17. Does this FOA consider solutions that are only applicable to large centralized power production?	6
Q18. Will making use of non-potable water sources (vs. using freshwater) be considered?	7
V. Questions for week ending: October 24, 2014.....	7
VI. Questions for week ending: October 31, 2014	7
Q19. We would like a clarification on the definition of "COP _{cool} " for a Sorption/Desorption system on page 23 of the document. Specifically, what does the term "Q _{heat,in} " include?	7
Q20. Is the cost of \$50/kw for installation cost plus material, or is it only for component cost?	7
Q21.A. In category 2B of the FOA, does the cost requirement of \$150/kWth include the cool storage cost? ..	7
Q21.B. Why is the cost requirement (\$150/kWth) the same for Category 2B and Category 2C of the FOA when the cost target for Category 2B is for multimode cooling plus cool storage and the cost target for Category 2C is for a standalone cool storage system?	8
Q22. If we propose an enabling technology for existing direct air-cooled condensers to Category 3, should we consider the cost for our proposed enabling technology only when determining the capital cost of the system?	8

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF QUESTIONS

Q23. Should I provide a quantitative number for the capital cost of the system in the concept paper?	8
Q24. Would a **** qualify for this funding opportunity?	8
Q25. Can I propose a technology that would not be enabling for power plant cooling systems, but that would result in significant water savings in power production?	9
Q26. In subcategory 2b: multimode (convection/radiative) cooling plus storage (page 24) the target metrics include radiative heat flux, $q > 100 \text{ w/m}^2$. What temperature change from the ambient (i.e. Delta t) does the specified heat flux correspond to?	9
Q27. The \$50/kWth capital cost for the cooling tower configuration seems to exclude the capital costs for the steam surface condenser. After adding the cost for the condenser, the total cooling system cost would be higher. Does this change the evaluation and associated targets?	9
Q28. In regards to Category 3 technical target 3.3 in Section I.E. of the FOA, "Prototype cooling capacity size Qcool," are concept papers required to show that the proposing team will achieve a prototype of this size (20–100 kWth) at the end of the project?	9
VII. Questions for week ending: January 16, 2015	10
Q29. Is ARPA-E aware of any non-federal sources of cost share that may be available for ARID applicants?	10
Q30. A prior modification of the ARID FOA inserted a clarifying sentence into the eligibility section which made it explicit that DOE GOGO's are ineligible to apply. This clarifying sentence appears not to have been carried over in later modifications of the FOA. Please confirm whether a DOE GOGO, such as NETL, is eligible to apply for funding under the subject FOA.	10
Q31.A. Would a team consisting of an FFRDC (****), one or more universities, and one or more small businesses (where the small businesses perform greater than 20% but less than 80% of the total work as measured by project cost), qualify for the 10% reduced cost sharing requirement?	10
Q31.B. My project team is not led by a small business, but includes small businesses. Does our Project Team qualify for the 12 month deferred cost share ("Grace Period")?	10
VIII. Questions for week ending: January 30, 2015	11
Q32. Our project team includes 4 large educational universities, and 2 for-profit companies (1 large & 1 small). We believe that we fall into the 10% cost share category with both companies meeting the mandatory minimum 20% cost share of total project costs. Please let us know if we qualify for reduced cost sharing of 10%?	11
Q33.A Are FFRDC's eligible to participate in the project, even though they cannot be used for cost share purposes?	11
Q33.B If FFRDCs are eligible to participate in a project; is there a maximum limit on the FFRDCs participation in a project?	11
Q34. Page 20 of the FOA states, "for all concepts that fall within Category 2, the size of the final prototype should be at the 20–50 kW scale". For Category 2A, does ARPA-E expect that successful projects will reach TRL 5 due to the 20 kW prototype?	12
IX. Questions for week ending: February 6, 2015	12

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TABLE OF QUESTIONS

Q35. Can you provide an unlocked version of the SF424A spreadsheet - or a password to unlock it? We would like to have the ability to add rows for additional tasks on the personnel tab, and change row height and column width in several places where the cell size is not large enough to display the value entered. 12

We'd also like to be able to reference values from other tabs in formulas to automatically calculate fringe and indirect costs. 12

As the file is currently configured, it will not permit users to reference the value of a locked cell when putting formulas into unlocked cells. For example: in row 10, columns D, E, & F of the tab "b. Fringe" it would be very handy to pull the unburdened labor costs from row 180 of the "a. Personnel" tab and include it in the formula to calculate fringe. Similarly, other values could be used to calculate indirect rates in row 9 of the "i. Indirect" tab 12

Q36. ARPA-E eXCHANGE provides a link to download the 2012 version of the SF-424. Should we use this form for our Full Application? 13

Q37. I have two universities and one small company. Can you please confirm that each group will cost-share 5% each? 13

I. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

A. If I have questions about this funding announcement, who do I contact?

ANSWER: Please see the FOA guidance on submitting FOA content questions and response publication. Applicants may submit questions regarding this ARPA-E's Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) to ARPA-E-CO@hq.doe.gov. All emails must include the FOA name and number in the subject line. The cover page and Executive Summary of the Funding Opportunity Announcement state the deadlines for submitting questions to ARPA-E-CO@hq.doe.gov.

B. How will I receive a response to questions submitted to arpa-e-co@hq.doe.gov about this FOA?

ANSWER: Responses are posted in the "Current Funding Opportunities FAQs" section of ARPA-E's website available at <http://arpa-e.energy.gov/?q=faq/current-funding-opportunities>. In addition, general questions about ARPA-E can be found at <http://arpa-e.energy.gov/?q=faq/general-questions>.

ARPA-E will post responses on a weekly basis to questions that are received. ARPA-E will cease to accept questions approximately 5 business days in advance of each submission deadline. Responses to questions received before the cutoff will be posted approximately one business day in advance of the submission deadline. ARPA-E may re-phrase questions or consolidate similar questions for administrative purposes.

C. Will ARPA-E post a response to every question submitted to arpa-e-co@hq.doe.gov?

ANSWER: No. ARPA-E will only post responses to questions that have not already been addressed by a published FAQ. Also, ARPA-E may consolidate similar questions for administrative purposes.

D. If I have questions about ARPA-E exchange, who do I contact?

ANSWER: Applicants may submit questions regarding ARPA-E's online application portal, ARPA-E eXCHANGE, to ExchangeHelp@hq.doe.gov. All emails must include the name and number of the Funding Opportunity Announcement in the subject line.

E. Can I speak or meet with the ARPA-E program director or other ARPA-E personnel about this funding opportunity announcement?

ANSWER: No. Upon the issuance of this Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA), ARPA-E Program Directors and other ARPA-E personnel are prohibited from communicating (in writing or otherwise) with Applicants, or potential Applicants, regarding the FOA. This "quiet period" remains in effect until ARPA-E's public announcement of its project selections. During the "quiet period," Applicants may submit questions regarding the FOA to ARPA-E-CO@hq.doe.gov with the FOA name and number in the subject line. Applicants may also submit questions regarding ARPA-E's online application portal, ARPA-E eXCHANGE, to ExchangeHelp@hq.doe.gov with the FOA name and number in the subject line. ARPA-E will not accept or respond to communications received by other means (e.g., fax, telephone, mail, hand delivery). Emails sent to other email addresses will be disregarded.

F. Can a person be PI on one proposal and a Co-PI on a second separate proposal?

ANSWER: Yes, an individual may be on more than one submission – either as a lead or member of a Project Team.

G. May applicants submit more than one concept paper to this funding opportunity?

ANSWER: Yes, but each Concept Paper must be “scientifically distinct”. This term is used in Section III.C.3 (Limitation on Number of Applications) of the FOA. In this context, the term “scientifically distinct” is used to emphasize that, in the event an Applicant intends to submit multiple concept papers/application, the applicant should propose distinct technical approaches in each application. This prohibition on duplicative applications involves a fact-based determination by ARPA-E to ensure a focused review of each technical concept, and appropriate use of ARPA-E's limited time/resources.

H. I have developed a technology that may be a good fit for this funding opportunity. Will ARPA-E please review my idea and let me know if it is responsive to this FOA?

ANSWER: ARPA-E will consider concepts that propose to meet or exceed the technical performance targets set forth in Section I.E (Technical Performance Targets) of the FOA and do not fall under Section I.F (Applications Specifically Not of Interest) of the FOA. Applicants must review the technical requirements of the FOA and independently determine whether their proposed concept warrants a submission.

I. Are foreign entities eligible to apply to this FOA?

ANSWER: Foreign entities are eligible to apply for funding. See Section III.A.3 (Eligibility Information- Foreign Entities) of the FOA. However, if the project is selected for award negotiations and an award is made, all work must be performed in the United States by subsidiaries or affiliates incorporated in the United States or U.S. territories, unless ARPA-E grants a foreign work waiver to allow performance of part of the work outside of the United States. ARPA-E's grant of a foreign work waiver is a fact dependent, case-by-case determination that is made only in exceptional circumstances and only for discrete parts of an award that necessitate foreign work. Applicants that anticipate the need for a foreign work waiver to perform some work outside of the U.S. should review Section 5 of the Business Assurances & Disclosures Form.

J. Are individuals eligible to apply to this FOA?

ANSWER: Yes. Individuals are eligible to apply for funding. See Section III.A (Eligibility Information) of the FOA. However, any ARPA-E award funding would need to be made to a business entity formed by the Applicant, if selected for award negotiations.

K. Are we required to register for the Teaming List for this FOA?

ANSWER: No. ARPA-E set up the Teaming Partner List for this FOA to facilitate formation of new project teams. There is no requirement for applicants or any team member to sign up/register for the Teaming Partner List. In addition, ARPA-E does not endorse or otherwise evaluate the qualifications of the entities that self-identify themselves for placement on the Teaming Partner List.

L. I missed the last Concept Paper deadline. Can I still submit a Full Application?

ANSWER: No. Only applicants who have successfully submitted a Concept Paper in eXCHANGE by the published deadline are eligible to submit a Full Application to the FOA.

M. Our project team includes several team members. Does each team member need to contribute cost share equally?

ANSWER: Although the cost share requirement applies to the Project Team as a whole, the funding agreement makes the Prime Recipient legally responsible for paying the entire cost share. See Section III.B.4 for more information on cost sharing. Each Project Team is free to determine how much each team member will contribute towards the cost share requirement. The amount contributed by individual Project Team members may vary, so long as the cost share requirement for the project as a whole is met.

N. Can you tell me whether my project team qualifies for reduced cost share?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide pre-submission assessments on a project team's specific cost sharing requirement.

O. Will in-kind contributions count towards meeting our cost share requirements?

ANSWER: Yes, if the in-kind contribution is determined to be allowable, allocable and reasonable by the ARPA-E Contracting Officer. Since this is necessarily fact determinative inquiry, these types of questions are answered based on a review of all relevant information by the Contracting Officer during award negotiations. For general guidance on acceptable cost share contributions and corresponding cost principles used by the ARPA-E Contracting Officer to make these determinations, see 10 C.F.R § 600.313 and § 600.317 (Cost Matching/Sharing and Cost Principles for For-Profit Organizations), 2 C.F.R. § 200.306 and 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Subpart E (Cost Matching/Sharing and Cost Principles for Institutes of Higher Education, Hospitals, Other Nonprofit Organizations, State and Local Governments).

P. We have a question concerning the impact of a large business seeking patent rights under a class waiver if our team qualifies for reduced cost share of 10%. Does this mean the entire team project is subject to 20% cost share or only the large business' portion of the project will be subject to 20% cost share?

ANSWER: Per Section II.B.3 (Reduced Cost Share Requirement) of the FOA, under this scenario, only the large business' portion of the work under this scenario is subject to the 20% minimum cost share requirement. Please see Section III.B.3 (Reduced Cost Share Requirement), Section III.B.4 (Legal Responsibility), and Section III.B.5 (Cost Share Allocation) of the FOA for more details on the cost sharing requirements. **NOTE: If the large business' portion of Total Project Costs is greater than 20%, then the project team's total cost share minimum is 20% since the team as a whole would no longer qualify for the 80/20 labor distribution for reduced cost share, per Section III.B.3 of the FOA.**

Q. Can you tell us whether our project team qualifies for reduced cost share based on the following scenario: []?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide pre-submission assessments on a project team's specific cost sharing requirement.

R. How should we include references in our Full Application? Do they count towards the overall page limitation for the Technical Volume?

ANSWER: Applicants may provide a list of references in a separate bibliography. Only bibliographic information may be contained in the references, and no additional text or commentary should be included. There is no page limit for the bibliographic references section of the Full Application.

S. Our team originally submitted a Concept Paper that listed [organization name 1] as the Prime Recipient. For our Full Application, can we change the lead organization to ** [organization name 2] instead?**

ANSWER: Yes, the ARPA-E eXCHANGE system will allow applicants to expand or otherwise modify the Project Team for their Full Applications.

T. Can I include new Co-PIs and/or sub-recipients in my Full Application?

ANSWER: Yes. Applicants may expand or otherwise modify the Project Team for their Full Applications.

U. My Concept Paper was encouraged. What are my chances of being selected for award negotiations by ARPA-E?

ANSWER: ARPA-E does not provide pre-submission assessments of Applicants' likelihood to receive funding.

V. Do sub-recipients also need to fill out the Business Assurances & Disclosures Form or is this filled out only by the Prime Recipient?

ANSWER: The Business Assurances & Disclosures Form requests information regarding the legal entity submitting the application as the Prime Recipient, the legal entities and/or individuals that are proposed to be Sub-recipients, and the PI/Co-PIs in their individual capacity. The Prime Recipient may submit one Business Assurances & Disclosures Form covering all of the Project Team members if it has authorization and information to answer on their behalf. Alternatively, the Prime Recipient may request Sub-recipients to complete and sign individual Business Assurances & Disclosures Forms that the Prime Recipient will append to its form.

II. Questions for week ending: OCTOBER 3, 2014

Q1. There is a submission deadline discrepancy between FOA-0001197 cover page “November 10, 2014” and FOA page 1 “November 3, 2014”. Please confirm Concept Paper Submission Deadline is November 10, 2014.

ANSWER: The Concept Paper submission deadline is November 10, 2014. ARPA-E issued a modification to the FOA on October 1, 2014 to reflect this information.

Q2. Can ARPA-E make their LCOE model available for public use? Where can we find it?

ANSWER: The power plant model was used as an internal tool to calculate performance and LCOE. Note that ARPA-E does not require Concept Papers to make use of the model and instead has specified technical targets in Section I.E (Technical Performance Targets), that support the program objectives specified in Section I.C (Program Objectives).

Q3. What are the assumptions and methodologies for their LCOE model?

ANSWER: The relevant assumptions and methodologies for the ARPA-E LCOE model are included in Section C.2, Techno-economic analysis for Indirect Dry-Cooling System (including the associated references) and in Table 1: “Working parameters used in the derivation of technical performance targets” found in Section E.

Q4. Is the cost of \$50/kW for insulation cost plus material or component cost only? Does it include operation cost? If it does, what are the key assumptions of electricity cost/kWhr and other assumptions?

ANSWER: The \$50/kW target for Category 1 technologies is for the capital cost of the technology, including all necessary components (insulation, material, etc). As it is a capital cost target, it does not include operating costs. Keep in mind, however, that one of the objectives of the ARID FOA is that technologies developed should result in less than 5% increase in the levelized cost of electricity. See Section I.C (Program Objectives) and Section I.E (Technical Performance Targets) of the FOA. ARPA-E does not prescribe an electricity cost/kWh to use in cost calculations, but it is recommended that concept papers and/or full applications identify and justify any cost assumptions made.

Q5. We have developed a ** and would like to know if our technology will qualify for ARID funding? Our technology involves an ****. Would this type of solution qualify for ARID consideration?**

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide a pre-submission assessment regarding the responsiveness of an Applicant’s technology or proposed concept. Applicants must review the Technical Categories of Interest specified in Section I.D and Applications Specifically Not of Interest specified in Section I.F of the FOA and independently determine whether their proposed concept warrants a submission to the ARID FOA.

III. Questions for week ending: OCTOBER 10, 2014

Q6. A. Would technologies that lead to significant reduction in water loss (> 75% reduction in water loss, compared to present day cooling towers), and have other significant benefits, be considered non-responsive, or are such solutions acceptable to ARPA-E?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide a pre-submission assessment regarding the responsiveness of an Applicant’s technology or proposed concept. Applicants must review the Technical Categories of Interest specified in Section I.D and Applications Specifically Not of Interest specified in Section I.F of the FOA and independently determine whether their proposed concept warrants a submission to the ARID FOA.

Q14.B The same enabling technology can significantly benefit the steam condenser and result in compact, lightweight, low maintenance condensers. Would it be acceptable to propose technology development that affects steam condensers to reduce water losses substantially?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide a pre-submission assessment regarding the responsiveness of an Applicant's technology or proposed concept. Applicants must review the Applications Specifically Not of Interest specified in Section I.F and Technical Categories of Interest specified in Section I.D of the FOA and independently determine whether their proposed concept warrants a submission to the ARID FOA.

Q15. Is the "COP_{cool}" metric (COP_{cool} > 2 on page 23) for a single-effect sorption system or will multi-effect systems that meet this metric be considered?

ANSWER: The "COP_{cool}" metric applies to all sorption systems, including single and multi-effect systems. Multi-effect systems that meet the relevant technical objectives and targets outlined in the FOA will be considered.

Q16. I have a question in regards to submission of Concept Papers for the ARID FOA. Can ideas on both Category 1 & 2 be proposed in a single Concept Paper or will such a submission be considered non-responsive? In other words, if we have ideas for both Category 1 and 2 (that may provide an integrated solution) should we submit two Concept Papers?

ANSWER: Please see Section I.D (Technical Categories of Interest) of the FOA. Concepts that include the development of technologies across multiple Categories (such as into 1 and 2, as suggested in this question) may be combined into a single paper or split into two (or more) separate Concept Papers. ARPA-E will not recommend an approach - it is up to the applicant to decide the best way to present their concept(s) to ARPA-E. Note that if the development of technologies across multiple Categories is presented in a single Concept Paper, it will be important that the Concept Paper make reference to and meet technical targets across all relevant categories. The proposer should also consider whether or not the combined system will fit best in Category 3.

IV. Questions for week ending: OCTOBER 17, 2014

Q17. Does this FOA consider solutions that are only applicable to large centralized power production?

ANSWER: No. At a minimum, concepts must be applicable to large centralized power production, but ARPA-E is also interested in those that may also be applicable to smaller, decentralized systems see, Section C.5 of the FOA, Scalability and Modularity for Commercialization.

Q18. Will making use of non-potable water sources (vs. using freshwater) be considered?

ANSWER: Non-potable sources may be used in the system, but note that the program objective regarding no net water dissipation would still apply. As per the relevant language in Section C of the FOA, Program Objectives: “The ARID program seeks to enable the development of transformational power plant cooling technologies that...dissipate no net water to the atmosphere (note that in cases where water vapor is dissipated to the atmosphere, not including surface water evaporation, an equal or greater amount of water vapor must be captured);” The FOA purposefully refers to general “water” dissipation, rather than “freshwater” dissipation. Thus, dissipation of any water (potable, nonpotable, freshwater, seawater, brackish water, reclaimed water, etc.) in the cooling process is viewed to be the same.

V. Questions for week ending: OCTOBER 24, 2014

No new questions received.

VI. Questions for week ending: OCTOBER 31, 2014

Q19. We would like a clarification on the definition of " COP_{cool} " for a Sorption/Desorption system on page 23 of the document. Specifically, what does the term " $Q_{heat,in}$ " include?

ANSWER: Please see ARID FOA Modification 2. The explanation for Section I.E Technical Performance Targets, Subcategory 2A: Sorption/Desorption Cooling System has been updated to clarify COP_{cool} .

Q20. Is the cost of \$50/kw for installation cost plus material, or is it only for component cost?

ANSWER: Please refer to Section I.E of the FOA. The description for the \$50/kw target specifies that the target is for “Capital cost of heat exchanger.” Therefore, installation cost should not be included in this calculation.

Q21.A. In category 2B of the FOA, does the cost requirement of \$150/kWth include the cool storage cost?

ANSWER: Yes, the cost requirement for Category 2B in Section I.E of the FOA includes the cool storage cost. In the explanation for Category 2B: Multimode (Convection/Radiative) Cooling Plus Storage, the FOA states, “The cost includes the cost of the full system. If a proposed concept will use a commercially available storage unit or a storage media that does not require development, it should not be included in the development plan, but should be specified and factored into the cost analysis.”

Q21.B. Why is the cost requirement (\$150/kWth) the same for Category 2B and Category 2C of the FOA when the cost target for Category 2B is for multimode cooling plus cool storage and the cost target for Category 2C is for a standalone cool storage system?

ANSWER: The cost target for Category 2C is not for a standalone cool storage system. Please refer to Section I.E of the FOA. In the explanation for Category 2C: Cool Storage System, the FOA states, “The cost includes the cost of the full system, including heat exchangers for charging...” Note that in Category 2B, the multimode convection/radiation cooling unit described is a heat exchanger that charges the storage unit. In Category 2C, the heat exchanger is generalized to allow for other technologies. Therefore, Categories 2B and 2C describe equivalent systems and thus have equivalent cost requirements.

Q22. If we propose an enabling technology for existing direct air-cooled condensers to Category 3, should we consider the cost for our proposed enabling technology only when determining the capital cost of the system?

ANSWER: No. Please refer to Section I.E of the FOA. In the explanation for Category 3, the FOA states, “The cost includes the cost of the full cooling system architecture, including any supplementary cooling systems that might be required. Only the proposed transformative technology should be included in the development plan, but other components and subsystems should be factored into the cost analysis.”

Q23. Should I provide a quantitative number for the capital cost of the system in the concept paper?

ANSWER: Yes. As stated in Section IV.C., Subsection 2 of the FOA, “To the extent possible, provide quantitative metrics in a table that compares the proposed technology concept to current and emerging technologies and to the technical performance targets in Section I.E of the FOA for the appropriate Technology Category in Section I.D of the FOA.”

Q24. Would a ** qualify for this funding opportunity?**

ANSWER: ARPA-E will consider concepts that propose to meet or exceed the technical performance targets set forth in Section I.E (Technical Performance Targets) of the FOA and do not fall under Section I.F (Applications Specifically Not of Interest) of the FOA. Applicants must review the technical requirements of the FOA and independently determine whether their proposed concept warrants a submission.

Q25. Can I propose a technology that would not be enabling for power plant cooling systems, but that would result in significant water savings in power production?

ANSWER: Please see the response to questions 13 and 24 above.

Q26. In subcategory 2b: multimode (convection/radiative) cooling plus storage (page 24) the target metrics include radiative heat flux, $q'' > 100 \text{ W/m}^2$. What temperature change from the ambient (i.e. ΔT) does the specified heat flux correspond to?

ANSWER: Please refer to Section I.C.4, subsection “Cool Storage” of the FOA, which states, “A radiative cooling system could be envisioned...assuming 30°C water exiting a heat exchanger. ...The sky temperature is approximately -50°C...the maximum theoretical heat flux is approximately 120 W/m².” From this, 100W/m² was chosen as the target.

Q27. The \$50/kWth capital cost for the cooling tower configuration seems to exclude the capital costs for the steam surface condenser. After adding the cost for the condenser, the total cooling system cost would be higher. Does this change the evaluation and associated targets?

ANSWER: The \$50/kWth in Section I.E of the FOA is the capital cost target for an air-cooled heat exchanger. It is correct that this target does not include the cost of the steam condenser; however, the cost of the steam condenser was included in the techno-economic analysis of the overall cooling system described in Section I.C.2 of the FOA. This techno-economic analysis was used to determine that \$50/kWth capital cost for the air-cooled heat exchanger would support the objectives of the FOA. Therefore, no change will be made to the evaluation criteria nor to the technical targets of the FOA.

Q28. In regards to Category 3 technical target 3.3 in Section I.E. of the FOA, “Prototype cooling capacity size Q_{cool} ,” are concept papers required to show that the proposing team will achieve a prototype of this size (20–100 kWth) at the end of the project?

ANSWER: Yes. Concepts proposed under Category 3 in Section I.E. of the FOA must propose a prototype at the following scale: $Q_{cool} = 20\text{--}100 \text{ kWth}$. See also Section IV.C. of the FOA for concept paper content requirements.

VII. Questions for week ending: JANUARY 16, 2015

Q29. Is ARPA-E aware of any non-federal sources of cost share that may be available for ARID applicants?

ANSWER: The California Energy Commission recently amended their funding solicitation to make ARID applicants with connections to California eligible to apply for awards of state funds that may be allowable as cost-share towards certain federal awards. See the following link for CEC funding eligibility and other CEC application requirements:

<http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/epic.html#PON-14-308>.

Please note that the CEC application deadline is January 20th.

Q30. A prior modification of the ARID FOA inserted a clarifying sentence into the eligibility section which made it explicit that DOE GOGO's are ineligible to apply. This clarifying sentence appears not to have been carried over in later modifications of the FOA. Please confirm whether a DOE GOGO, such as NETL, is eligible to apply for funding under the subject FOA.

ANSWER: DOE Government-Owned, Government-Operated (GOGOs) national laboratories, such as NETL, do not meet the eligibility requirements of the ARID FOA and therefore are not eligible to apply for funding. Per Section III.C.1 (Compliant Criteria) of the FOA, applicants must meet the eligibility requirements in Section III.A (Eligibility Criteria) of the FOA. DOE GOGOs are not listed as an eligible entity type under Section III.A of the FOA, thus, DOE GOGOs are not eligible to apply for funding under the ARID FOA.

Q31.A. Would a team consisting of an FFRDC (**), one or more universities, and one or more small businesses (where the small businesses perform greater than 20% but less than 80% of the total work as measured by project cost), qualify for the 10% reduced cost sharing requirement?**

ANSWER: Please review Modification 4 of the FOA at Section III.B (Reduced Cost Share Requirement) for clarification of cost share requirements.

To qualify for reduced cost share of 10%, domestic educational institutions, domestic nonprofits, small businesses and/or FFRDCs must perform greater than or equal to 80% of the total work under the funding agreement (as measured by the Total Project Cost).

Q31.B. My project team is not led by a small business, but includes small businesses. Does our Project Team qualify for the 12 month deferred cost share ("Grace Period")?

ANSWER: The cost share Grace Period applies only to projects led by a small business AND on which small businesses perform greater than 80% of the work. See Section III.B.3 (Reduced Cost Share Requirement) of the FOA for more details on the cost sharing requirements for this FOA.

VIII. Questions for week ending: JANUARY 30, 2015

Q32. Our project team includes 4 large educational universities, and 2 for-profit companies (1 large & 1 small). We believe that we fall into the 10% cost share category with both companies meeting the mandatory minimum 20% cost share of total project costs. Please let us know if we qualify for reduced cost sharing of 10%?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide pre-submission assessments on a project team's specific cost sharing requirement. To qualify for reduced cost share of 10%, the domestic educational institutions and small business on the Project Team perform greater than or equal to 80%, of the **total work** under the funding agreement. Total work is measured by the total project costs over the entire project period. Applicants must review the cost share requirements of this funding opportunity to determine if their project may be eligible for reduced cost share. Please see Section III.B.3 ("Reduced Cost Share Requirement") of the FOA for more details.

Note also that if a large business seeks patent rights under a class waiver, or other patent waiver requested under 10 C.F.R. § 783, the large business must meet the statutory minimum cost share requirement (20%) for its portion of the Total Project Cost. Please see Frequently Asked Question P above.

Q33.A Are FFRDC's eligible to participate in the project, even though they cannot be used for cost share purposes?

ANSWER: Per Section III.A.2 (Eligibility Criteria – Domestic Entities) of the FOA, FFRDCs are eligible to apply for funding as the lead organization for a Project Team or as a member of a Project Team, but not a Standalone Applicant (i.e. FFRDCs may not perform 100% of the total work as measured by Total Project Cost and see Footnote 42 of the FOA for the definition of Total Project Cost). In addition, FFRDCs may contribute allowable, allocable, and reasonable cost share, but only if the contributions are paid directly from the contractor's Management Fee or a non-Federal source. Please see Section III.B.7 (Cost Share Contributions by FFRDCs and GOGOs) of the FOA for more information on cost sharing and FFRDC contributions.

Q33.B If FFRDCs are eligible to participate in a project; is there a maximum limit on the FFRDCs participation in a project?

ANSWER: Yes, per Section III.A.2 (Eligibility Criteria – Domestic Entities) of the FOA, FFRDCs cannot apply as a Standalone Applicant

Q34. Page 20 of the FOA states, “for all concepts that fall within Category 2, the size of the final prototype should be at the 20–50 kW scale”. For Category 2A, does ARPA-E expect that successful projects will reach TRL 5 due to the 20 kW prototype?

ANSWER: ARPA-E has not set a specific TRL requirement for ARID technologies to achieve by the end of the project. Please see Section I.E (Technical Performance Targets) of the FOA for the technical targets for each technical Category of Interest that ARPA-E expects recipients to meet by the end of the project.

IX. Questions for week ending: FEBRUARY 6, 2015

Q35. Can you provide an unlocked version of the SF424A spreadsheet - or a password to unlock it? We would like to have the ability to add rows for additional tasks on the personnel tab, and change row height and column width in several places where the cell size is not large enough to display the value entered.

We’d also like to be able to reference values from other tabs in formulas to automatically calculate fringe and indirect costs.

As the file is currently configured, it will not permit users to reference the value of a locked cell when putting formulas into unlocked cells. For example: in row 10, columns D, E, & F of the tab “b. Fringe” it would be very handy to pull the unburdened labor costs from row 180 of the “a. Personnel” tab and include it in the formula to calculate fringe. Similarly, other values could be used to calculate indirect rates in row 9 of the “i. Indirect” tab

ANSWER: The Budget Justification Workbook/SF-424A (“Workbook”) is a protected document so that ARPA-E can ensure consistency in budgetary calculations from applicants. Per Section IV.D.3 (Budget Justification Workbook/SF-424A) of the FOA, applicants are required to complete the Workbook available on ARPA-E eXCHANGE. Applicants should not create and submit alternate versions of the Workbook to satisfy this requirement. Applicants may refer to Section IV.D.3 of the FOA for more information on the Workbook.

Due to the wide variation in methods used to calculate fringe and indirect amounts, ARPA-E has not included set formulas in the Fringe Benefits or Indirect Costs sheets. ARPA-E has provided an “Explanations/Comments/Calculations/Formula” field for The Fringe Benefits and Indirect Costs sheets so that applicants can show how they calculated their rates. It is recommended that applicants reserve calculations for this field, and simply enter a total dollar amount into the “Total Fringe Requested” row at the top of the sheet. Should you prefer to use formulas in the “Total Fringe Requested” row, Excel allows you to enter text in the formula box. For the example you provided, you could enter “=‘a. Personnel’!E180” in order to capture a number listed in Row 180, Column E of the Personnel tab.

Q36. ARPA-E eXCHANGE provides a link to download the 2012 version of the SF-424. Should we use this form for our Full Application?

ANSWER: ARPA-E will accept either the most recent version of the SF-424 or the version provided on eXCHANGE for the ARID FOA.

Q37. I have two universities and one small company. Can you please confirm that each group will cost-share 5% each?

ANSWER: ARPA-E may not provide pre-submission assessments on a project team's specific cost sharing requirement. Please see Section III.B.3 (Reduced Cost Share Requirement) for information on the criteria to receive a reduced cost share requirement under the ARID FOA. Also, please see the responses provided for Question 32 and FAQ M above.