

# Questions and Answers

*This document provides answers to questions submitted in response to the:*

## [Request for Proposals to Develop a Plan to Improve Estimates of Carbon Sequestration in Grasslands](#)

*The deadline for submitting questions was October 25, 2022. NFWF offers answers in this format to provide all potential applicants with equal access to the same information.*

### **Question 1: Can you provide guidance on the expected budget cap? Is there a funding threshold we should be aware of?**

Answer: NFWF asks applicants to develop proposal budgets that reflect the cost of effectively implementing the scope of work outlined in the Request for Proposals. In accordance with its current procurement policy, NFWF declines to provide information on funding targets or ranges in association with contract solicitations.

### **Question 2: This RFP reads like a planning grant. Would NFWF implement the recommended plan internally or would an outside organization get the implementation grant? If the latter, would the organization writing the plan get preference?**

Answer: This is a solicitation for contractual services to develop the plan for NFWF. Implementation of the plan, including the appropriate solicitation and contracting methods, will be dependent on the deliverables of this initial contract. Prior organizational engagement will not give preference for future opportunities.

### **Question 3: Will this contract be supported with funding from fossil fuel companies?**

Answer: None of the funding for this contract derives from fossil fuel companies.

### **Question 4: Will NFWF staff or contractors be responsible for all field data collection, and identification of treatment sites? For example, will NFWF staff collect soil cores and identify sites that can be used to measure the baseline, impact of different grazing management practices, or grassland restoration efforts? Or, would the contractor be responsible for field data collection and specific site identification (as opposed to developing a framework for data collection and site identification)?**

Answer: This RFP does not include a field data-collection component. It is confined to the development of a plan. The implementation of that plan will likely require a third party to be responsible for field data collection and the identification of treatment sites. That third party has not been identified at this time.

### **Question 5: What is the potential budget for implementing a plan to improve estimates of carbon sequestration in grasslands? This question is separate from questions about the budget to develop the plan as described in the RFP. It relates to the available budget to implement a given plan/proposal, including all field sampling/data collection, and contracting costs for modeling.**

Answer: Through this RFP, we are looking for expert input on this very question. There is currently no specific funding amount planned for the implementation.

**Question 6: Beyond conflicts of interest described in the RFP, are there any other eligibility requirements?**

Answer: All of the eligibility criteria are spelled out on pp. 6–7 of the RFP. In addition to conflicts of interest, they include but are not limited to type of institution, Federal tax liabilities, criminal violation and SAM Exclusions.

**Question 7: Are geospatial machine-learning approaches that estimate changes in soil organic carbon and other greenhouse gas fluxes suitable, or should proposals limit themselves to mechanistic, process-based models such as DNDC, Century, or RothC?**

Answer: We are open to any methodology, including innovative or novel approaches that can accomplish the tasks laid out in the RFP. We would suggest describing why any proposed innovative or novel approach would be better than the more common recommended approaches described in the scientific literature.

**Question 8: Can we apply jointly with another partner? Is there any limitation on the number of people or organizations coming together for a single proposal?**

Answer: Proposals can reflect collaboration among multiple partners for the purpose of convening the expertise and capacity needed to effectively perform the scope of work. However, one entity will serve as the primary contractor and subcontract work out to partners as needed. Although there is no limit on the number of subcontractors, the proposal review process will heavily weight the qualifications and capacity of the primary contractor to provide deliverables. In addition, the larger administrative burden and cost associated with an extensive number of subcontracts can sometimes reduce proposal cost-effectiveness, which is another important criterion in the review process.

**Question 9: Are there any historical data from samplings from the NFWF projects in that area? Primary data of interest includes geolocated soil organic carbon (SOC) or soil organic matter (SOM), and bulk density values.**

Answer: We have not collected any SOC or SOM samples from our project sites. Any existing data, if available, would be associated with another entity's sampling effort.

**Question 10: Will the study area include the full extent of NFWF's Northern Great Plains Landscape, or only NFWF's project areas within it? If the latter, is there a map or shapefile that applicants can access in advance to help them understand the extension of land and potential segmentation/stratification of it?**

Answer: We are interested only in changes in soil carbon occurring on project sites where we have funded improved grazing management and grassland restoration. The current acreage of those sites is approximately 3,000,000 acres, but we expect projects will total up to 5,000,000 acres by 2026. Spatial data indicating specific project sites are not available at this time.