

**Subject:** Additional Guidance - NA Research Call  
**From:** Parrish Galusky <Parrish.Galusky@NETL.DOE.GOV>  
**Date:** Mon, 07 Jul 2008 17:19:04 -0400  
**To:** Parrish Galusky <Parrish.Galusky@NETL.DOE.GOV>

1) On page 15, under B1, it talks about the cover sheet. The first sentence starts with "The form..." Is there a specific form for the cover?

Response - The cover sheet should be DOE Form 5700.2 (or whatever the current equivalent is). Please leave Item 8 blank and enter Federal Funding requested into Item 12.

2) Specific file names are given for submission pieces. There is no filename given for the "technical content." Do you have a preference here?

Response - Technical content can be named "Technical.pdf". Application reviews will not be automated so any appropriately descriptive naming convention will be acceptable.

3) On p. 21, under c "Commitment Letters...", the solicitation says "If a third party, i.e., a party other than the organization submitting the application) proposes to provide all or part of the required cost sharing, the applicant must include a letter from the third party stating that is is committed to providing a specific minimum dollar amount of cost sharing". In the next paragraph, the solicitation says that the NACs must provide letters providing evidence of corporate commitment to increase energy efficiencies and that they are "committed to fulfill all the NAC responsibilities (e.g., building construction, retrofit, long-term nonitoring) previously identified." The questions are: Are the NACs considered third parties subject to paragraph (1) and hence they would be required to submit a letter with a specific minimum dollar amount of the cost sharing, or is that provision only applicable to other kinds of third parties, e.g., a State government, non-profit, association or other kind of organization that may contribute funding or work in kind to the project? Is it sufficient for our letters from the NACs to say that they understand the 20% cost sharing requirement and are prepared to do that? (We hesitate to have them commit to a specific minimum when the negotiations following the award will likely result in some adjustments to all of the budgets. Given many letters have been signed by senior managers in the NACs with the general 20% cost-sharing language, we also don't want to burden them with the chore of signing a second letter with an exact amount in it.

Response - NACs (as well as any subcontractors) are considered third party participants since the DOE will have a contractual relationship with only the CDBT Lead (National Lab). Evidence of meeting the 20% cost share of total project costs (i.e., Federal plus Non-Federal share) is critically important and the level of detail will likely increase credibility with reviewers. For example, the statement "Company XYZ will provide 20% in-kind cost share for building redesign work." is not that definitive and strong of a statement, and this leaves doubt as to the level of cost share for the entire NA project (CDBT led activities among 6 NACs for all tasks). The 20% requirement is based on total project cost so a project having \$5M Federal share, for example, would have an obligation of \$1.25M cost share.

Expected cost sharing levels (or anticipated ranges) based on more detailed information (e.g., 50 hours per month valued at \$100 per hour, 4 trips per year valued at \$4500 per trip for travel expenses and labor) would likely instill more confidence in the reviewers and result in a higher rating. More generically, the statement "Company XYZ will provide in-kind cost share equivalent to at least 20% of total project costs for efforts focused on increasing the energy efficiency of our company's building stock as detailed in [National Lab]'s proposal entitled '[Project Title]'. Over the expected 5 year project, we anticipate this cost share value to be between \$200,000 and \$300,000." is more defined and would likely lead to a higher rating than the first example.

Evaluators will rate NAC participation based on their individual view of how well commitment letters convey the level of cost share, the likelihood that it will be

fulfilled, and overall confidence that NACs support the project and will fulfill all requirements.

4) On p. 16, the solicitation says not to include URLs:  
Do not include any Internet addresses (URLs) that provide information necessary to evaluate the application as information contained in those sites will not be reviewed.

On p. 25, the following is stated:  
Clear, documented evidence of corporate commitment to advance energy efficiency of building stock to the levels specified in this Research Call (demonstrated in public announcements and reports with reference, e.g., URL, that may be accessed by reviewers).

It seems necessary to include URLs as evidence of corporate committment since we cannot include all reports and information on the NACs websites in the proposal.

Response - In general, URLs are not to be included to provide information (e.g., technical expertise, bios, relevant experience) necessary for evaluation of the specific project/subprojects proposed. These aspects should be tailored into and specific to the application.

Conversely, NAC corporate commitment to advance energy efficiency in their building stock is expected to already be on public record and independent of the proposed project/subprojects. Since evidence of this (e.g., corporate policy, goals, objectives, mission statements, etc.) should already exist in various public announcements, URLs may be the most efficient means for verification by reviewers.

For example, "Company XYZ has stated a corporate objective to reduce building energy use 50% by 2013 in their 2007 Annual Report, page 37 ([www.xyz.com/annualreport.pdf](http://www.xyz.com/annualreport.pdf))." could be easily verified by reviewers and provides evidence of stand-alone corporate commitment already in existance.

thanks,  
Parrish

\*\*\*\*\*  
Parrish Galusky  
US Department of Energy  
National Energy Technology Laboratory  
3610 Collins Ferry Road \*\*\*\*\* (use this line only for package delivery)\*\*\*\*\*  
P.O. Box 880 \*\*\*\*\*(use this line only for regular letter mail)\*\*\*\*\*  
Morgantown, WV 26507  
\*\*\*\*\*  
[galusky@netl.doe.gov](mailto:galusky@netl.doe.gov)  
phone: (304) 285-4358  
fax: (304) 285-4403