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Competition Overview

OUTCOMES
Competition Overview

TOTAL SUBMISSIONS

Capital Challenge
- 56 submissions
- 43 technically eligible
- 17 awards

Venture Challenge
- 180 submissions
- 128 technically eligible
- 33 awards

236 total submissions
171 technically eligible submissions
50 total awards
TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

DON'T GET KNOCKED OUT BY A MISTAKE

Technical Review

Merit Review

Award
Technical Requirements

As stated in the B2S NOFO, the following technical deficiencies may preclude an application from merit review:

- Common fatal application flaws:
  - Ineligible Entities
  - Missing Documentation
  - Undermatching

Passing technical review is a prerequisite for merit review.

You can request technical eligibility guidance during the application period, but don’t wait until it’s too late!
**Technical Requirements**

**COMMON TECHNICAL ISSUES & TIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineligible Entities</th>
<th>The list of eligible entities is always outlined in the Executive Summary of the NOFO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small business &amp; individuals are not eligible applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants with an active EDA Regional Innovation Strategies (RIS) award were not eligible for this competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Documentation</td>
<td>See Appendix C for the list of required documents by entity type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) compliance is a requirement and should be noted on the on SF-424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entities that are not political subdivisions of states are required to submit letters of government support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermatching</td>
<td>Matching share must be 1) eligible and 2) equal to at least 50% of the total project cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match letters (applicant-provided &amp; 3rd-party) must enumerate the total and affirm that the funds are unencumbered, unrestricted, and committed at the time of award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program income and matching share provided by contractors under the award were ineligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Requirements

Use Appendix C to ensure you have sufficient documentation for your application...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Title/Description/Reference</th>
<th>Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Narrative</td>
<td>See section D.2.i.a (p. 8)</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Narrative and Staffing Plan</td>
<td>See section D.2.i.b (p. 10)</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Share Commitment Letters</td>
<td>See section D.2.i.c (p. 11)</td>
<td>Source 1 Source 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-424</td>
<td>Application for Federal Assistance</td>
<td>Applicant 1 Applicant 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-424A</td>
<td>Budget Information-Non-Construction Programs</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form CD-511</td>
<td>Certification Regarding Lobbying (if applicable)</td>
<td>Applicant 1 Applicant 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-LLL</td>
<td>Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (if applicable)</td>
<td>Applicant 1 Applicant 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOC/EO 12372 Compliance Documentation</td>
<td>See section D.2.ii.b.1) (p. 12) and <a href="https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SPOC-4-13-20.pdf">https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SPOC-4-13-20.pdf</a> (if applicable)</td>
<td>State 1 State 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Agreement</td>
<td>See section D.2.ii.b.3) (p. 13)</td>
<td>Applicant 1 Applicant 2 etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Requirements

…these vary according to the type of entity (or entities) that are submitting the application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Narrative and Staffing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Share Commitment Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local Government Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-424A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-424B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form CD-511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form SF-LLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALWAYS REMEMBER!
BUILDING REGIONAL ECONOMIES THROUGH SCALABLE STARTUPS
Merit Review

TRENDS ACROSS REVIEW CATEGORIES
# Merit Review

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

### ECOSYSTEM RESOURCES & ASSETS

#### Successful Applications

- ★★★ Contextualized regional assets & challenges in relation to industries and sectors targeted for economic development
- ★★★ Provided quantitative data to substantiate assertions of regional needs & opportunities
- ★★★ Descriptions of assets & challenges provided comprehensive, clear picture of the region and opportunities to be leveraged through the award

#### Unsuccessful Applications

- ☆☆☆ Failed to provide both assets and challenges
- ☆☆☆ Did not connect project objectives to regional challenges
- ☆☆☆ Overlooked descriptions assets & challenges in the region and centered on those of the applicant
- ☆☆☆ Lacked explanation of how the project will address regional needs and how the applicant would leverage regional assets
### Successful Applications

- ★★★ Connected the project to specific solutions to address problems faced by regional industries
- ★★★ Descriptions of proposed solution were bolstered with clear processes to achieve the solution
- ★★★ Substantiated feasibility with specific implementation plans and evidence of applicant’s related achievements
- ★★★ Identified target participants and included clear outreach plans that would yield participation

### Unsuccessful Applications

- ★★★ Provided unspecific or convoluted solutions with unclear implementation
- ★★★ Focused on augmenting the applicant’s capacity without a connection to regional challenges & opportunities
- ★★★ Failed to convey the impact of the proposed solution on target participants
## Merit Review

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

## USE OF PARTNER ENTITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful Applications</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★ Overemphasized potential partners as evidence of project strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought in partners across a variety industries and/or stakeholder groups</td>
<td>★★★ Descriptions of partners lacked roles and their connection to project goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>★★★ Partnerships appeared temporary and lacked the sustainability necessary to collaborate around and achieve the goals of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrated each partner’s relationship to the project’s goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated prior achievements, existing momentum, and/or shared goals to corroborate the strength of partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth and diversity of partnerships indicate durability during and beyond the term of the grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Measurable Goals & Sustainability

### Successful Applications

- ★★★ Illustrated outputs and outcomes by year, using numerical projections
- ★★★ Articulated goals in terms of measurable, specific metrics
- ★★★ Developed subgoals to extrapolate the project’s regional impact, beyond the target participants
- ★★★ Included contingency plans and strategies for project sustainability beyond the grant term

### Unsuccessful Applications

- ★☆☆ Lacked numerical projections
- ★☆☆ Outcomes and outputs were vague
- ★☆☆ Omitted a tracking strategy to measure progress towards stated goals
- ★☆☆ Failed to address the availability of future financial support and other means of financial sustainability
Merit Review

EVALUATION CRITERIA

BUDGET & STAFFING PLAN

Successful Applications

★★★★ Justified and explained how project resources would be allocated

★★★★ Provided a detailed budget broken down by year

★★★★ Leveraged existing partnerships and regional infrastructure

★★★★ Featured experienced team members and personnel

Unsuccessful Applications

★★★ Intended uses of project resources were unclear, even when provided in the budget

★★★ Budgets were not formatted in a table

★★ Did not have clear personnel roles or how these team members would impact the project

★★ Descriptions of partners lacked roles and their connection to project goals
**Merit Review**

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**ALIGNMENT WITH B2S PROGRAM GOALS**

**Successful Applications**

- ★★★ Highlighted specific industries, which enabled more specific and feasible outreach plans
- ★★★ Proposed a comprehensive approach to addressing regional challenges & leveraging opportunities
- ★★★ Utilized the Project Narrative guidance and provided clear, specific details without exceeding the page limit

**Unsuccessful Applications**

- ★★★ Failed to align project objectives and impacts with the program goals stated in the NOFO
- ★★★ Featured unrealistic, unjustified costs that exceeded the potential value of the project’s impact
- ★★★ Did not build on prior or existing infrastructure, resources, or momentum
Merit Review

TIPS FOR SUBMITTING A COMPETITIVE PROJECT NARRATIVE

• Convey how the project addresses a strategic gap in the region’s capacity to commercialize emergent technology through scalable startups
• Connect the project to existing or potential growth industries in the region
• Define target participants, partners, and their roles in the project
• Substantiate the scope of work with measurable metrics
• Provide dates for achieving key milestones
• Illustrate long-term project sustainability and impact
Merit Review

TIPS FOR SUBMITTING A COMPETITIVE BUDGET NARRATIVE

- Budget amounts should correspond with inputs in the SF-424 & SF-424A
- Staffing plan should list positions and roles of members assigned to the project
- Identify and justify how federal and match funds in each line item will be used
- Itemize valuation for in-kind contributions

The Budget Narrative is just as important as the Project Narrative!
Requesting Application Feedback

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING

1. Watch this webinar

2. Identify your application’s strengths and weaknesses in your email to OIE@eda.gov

Tips

- Re-read your application in its entirety—don’t forget the budget!
- Invite members of the project team’s leadership
Future Funding Opportunities

START PLANNING EARLY
Program Mission

The STEM Talent Challenge aims to build STEM talent training systems to strengthen regional innovation economies.

Eligible Entities

- State
- Indian tribe
- City or other political subdivision
- Non-profit
- Institute of higher-ed
- Public-private partnership
- Science/research park
- Federal laboratory
- Economic development organization

Funding Details

- A total of $2M was appropriated for the FY 2021 Challenge
- Funding requests could be made for up to $250,000
- 1:1 match required
- 24 month project period

Desired Outputs

- Utilize STEM work-based learning and training models
- Increase Regional Innovation Capacity
- Increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in STEM fields

For more information on the next competition cycle, visit eda.gov/oie/stem or email oie@eda.gov
Build to Scale (B2S) 2022

Pending appropriations, B2S will return in early 2022

Subscribe to the EDA newsletter for updates

Visit eda.gov