



**Platforms for Advanced Wireless Research (PAWR)
Round III Request for Proposals (RFP)
Questions and Answers
*Updated 12/5/19***

Question: There are a few proposed team members are investigators (PI and co-PIs) on a small subaward affiliated with a future year of an awarded PAWR platform. Are these team members allowed to serve as PIs/Co-PIs for a prospective Round 3 proposal?

- **Answer:** A PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel can only be funded on one PAWR award at a time. Your organization may proceed with your Round 3 PAWR LOI and Full Proposal submission. Should your organization be selected as a finalist for the Site Visit stage and ultimately be considered for a PAWR award, then you will need to choose to be associated with (and funded by) only one PAWR Platform.

Question: We are planning to partner with a non-profit electric cooperative that is a broadband provider for rural areas in town. The electric cooperative is not classified within any of the non-profit, non-academic examples described in the RFP. Is the non-profit electric cooperative eligible to participate in the Round 3 proposal?

- **Answer:** The electric cooperative is an eligible partner institution. As the electric cooperative is a non-profit, they are also eligible to participate as the lead institution, provided that an academic partner is also involved in the proposed platform.

Question: Are for-profit companies, which are not part of the Industry Consortium, eligible to participate as the lead organization?

Answer: For-profit organizations that are not members of the PAWR Industry Consortium may also participate within proposing teams (Senior Personnel or Consultants) but may not submit proposals as the lead organization. The proposal may request funds under any of the categories listed so long as the item and amount are considered necessary, reasonable, allocable, and allowable per 2 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 200, Subpart E. For-profit entities are subject to the cost principles contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, Part 31.

Question: Are there PPO guidelines for budgeting PI time for the proposed platform?

Answer: The PPO does not have set guidelines regarding the budgeting of PI time. As a historical example, most PIs/Co-PIs associated with an awarded PAWR Platform had a yearly calendar appointment of 0.5-1.0 per year (per PI).

Question: How do we plan resource allocation for project management? Are there any recommended guidelines for teams?

Answer: Research allocation for project management is not a core component for submission of a LOI or Full Proposal. Should your proposal be selected to advance beyond the Site Visit stage, your team will be provided detailed guidelines regarding the PPO's expectations for project management. For example, your team will be asked to create a 5-year Gantt Chart that includes activities, milestones, deliverables, and critical path items. As a reminder, one of the co-PIs or senior personnel must be a



qualified project manager with demonstrated, relevant experience - the PPO recommends allocating grant dollars for this project manager.

Question: The RFP focuses on “low-density, rural areas”. Given that there is no single definition of concepts such as rural cities/communities and many rural communities have small pots of dense populations (e.g., in small town/cities), does the RFP have any specific focus on any particular low-density, rural areas?

Answer: The “rural area” term is loosely characterized by a geographic area with sparse population density, a geographic barrier (e.g. wooded area, hilly terrain) to providing connectivity, long distance from its nearest internet service provider (ISP), or a perceived lower consumer demand. The RFP does not prioritize one characteristic, but ideally a proposed platform would correlate technical solutions presented with one or more of the above.

Question: Our city is interested in responding to the RFP, but we are wondering if you are limiting this to rural communities? Our city doesn't fit the Federal definition of rural.

Answer: The community and testbed area do not have to meet any technical definition of "rural," but they do have to credibly claim to address the problem of long distance, high bandwidth coverage challenges. Any community is open to respond and to propose hosting a testbed, provided that the testbed area can be credibly described as rural and addresses the technical goals and requirements described in the RFP.

Question: The RFP uses the term “local ISPs” - how should this term be interpreted? Should it be defined as ISPs with local presence at/around the PAWR deployment sites” instead of “relatively small, community ISPs local to the PAWR deployment sites”?

Answer: Yes, this can be interpreted in this way (“ISPs with local presence at/around the PAWR deployment sites”).

Question: The “Product list” in Appendix 2 has “SDR – Basic Features” and “SDR – Advanced Features”. What are the key differences between the two types of SDRs?

Answer: Advanced features refer to large FPGA/ multiple DSP and/or co-located on board compute on SDR.

Question: The RFP mentioned “potential funding from other federal agencies.” Can any information can be shared about what these potential funding agencies may be and what their main interests in PAWR platforms may be?

Answer: No further details can be provided right now, though the other agencies have interests that align well with the PAWR program as outlined in the RFP.

Question: Can any information on the AERPAW infrastructure (e.g., number and types of nodes to be deployed and spatial distribution of nodes) be shared so that we can avoid duplication when proposing new candidate PAWR platforms?

Answer: The AERPAW website can be found at <http://aerpaw.org>. Please refer to this website for more details.



Question: Can foreign (non-US) academic institutions or non-US communities participate as partners?

Answer: Foreign (non-US) academic institutions and foreign (non-US) communities may participate in a PAWR proposal, but they cannot be compensated with PAWR funds. No PAWR money or equipment can flow from the United States to foreign universities, communities, or entities.

Question: Who can submit a PAWRMatch Profile?

Answer: All institutions and individuals are welcome to submit a PAWRMatch profile. Institutions and individuals may submit their profile here - <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdVouVfQvfE7N6OpvunUxChXJsbLBHgkwu3SHjUuSFjNZv9nw/viewform>

Question: Who will review PAWR proposals?

Answer: Full Proposals will be evaluated by a peer review panel. The panels will be composed of subject matter experts from academia, various government agencies and industry, including experts from companies that are members of the PAWR Industry Consortium.

Question: What review criteria will be used to evaluate a proposal?

Answer: The six review criteria include the following:

1. Vision and Technical Merit
2. Research Community
3. Community Engagement
4. Alignment with PAWR Vision
5. Implementation plan
6. Sustainability

Please refer to the RFP for further descriptions of these merit review criteria.

Question: During the Full Proposal stage, what if the vision of the proposers cannot be fulfilled with the equipment and services contributed by the Industry Consortium?

Answer: Proposers can always utilize cash to pursue equipment and/or service providers beyond the Industry Consortium.

Question: Is international partnership considered an advantage/disadvantage? Can I budget for international researchers/facilities in my proposal?

Answer: International partnerships can be considered an advantage if they enhance one or more of the following: (a) usability; (b) diversity and/or technical depth of research focus areas supported; and (c) sustainability models. However, no funds can be allocated to international researchers/facilities in the proposal.

Question: Are there page limitations to the PAWR Excel Budget Template?

Answer: There are no page limitations to the spreadsheet.

Question: Can there be two official PIs for a proposed platform (rather than a PI and Co-PI)?



Answer: There should only be one official PI for your proposal. The other individual should be listed as a Co-PI. However, for communication-related purposes, if you would like the PPO to communicate with the PI and co-PI, please let us know and we would be happy to add that co-PI to the distribution list.

Question: Are wireless carriers, such as Verizon and AT&T are considered ISPs?

Answer: Yes, wireless carriers, such as Verizon and AT&T are considered ISPs.

Question: What are roles of ISP and Community leaders in addition to collaboration? Are there any suggestions for their work?

Answer: It is hoped that local ISPs and for-profit organizations will contribute facilities and other resources to enhance team capabilities. ISPs and other for-profit companies can participate as vendors in the project. In their platform design description, proposers should incorporate overall community and local ISP or network provider commitment and engagement, and the level of community and network facilities, resources and services made available for the project, including but not limited to campus or community IT support, fiber backhaul and power provided to the sites, and expedited permitting for site deployment.

Question: Need end users or market to be identified during the project period ?

Answer: The key here is to distinguish between academic/research users and commercial service provider users. If you are partnering with an ISP/commercial provider, then end users/a market should be identified. If academic/research users will be using the platform, then you do not need to identify the end users.

Question: Some of the equipment/devices shown as available in the RFP (e.g., MmWave point-to-point from Telecom Infra Project and Mobile Device 5G from Samsung) are not included in the Budget Template file. May we assume that those equipment/devices are still available so that we can treat them as in-kind contributions from the PAWR Industry Consortium?

Answer: The Excel Budget Template provided on November 21, 2019 contains the most up-to-date in-kind availability of equipment and services.

Question: Who should the letters of support from the community and partners be addressed to?

Answer: The PPO does not have a preference. For example, the letters of support could be made out to the project PI or the PAWR PPO.

Question: How should letters of support be uploaded to EDAS?

Answer: Letters of support should be uploaded within the Other Required Documents and Information - Part 3 section within EDAS.



Question: Can we make changes to the title, upload revised documents before the submission deadline? I want to make sure we have some flexibility in case we find an error in our documents or budget

Answer: Yes, you can make changes to your title and upload revised documents up until the submission deadline of December 13, 2019 at 6:00 pm Eastern.

- What are roles of ISP and Community leaders in additional to consultant and collaborative for testing ? Will they be hired as team members and work daily for this effort ? Any budget suggestion for their work ?