FAQs about the TechAccess: AI-Ready America National Coordination Lead OTASO

Table of Contents

A) Submitting to both the National Lead and State/Territory Coordination Hubs (OTASO and Solicitation NSF 26-508) 2

B) Characteristics of a Highly Qualified Organization (OTASO Section 5.1) 2

C) Workstream 1: State/Territory-level Coordination Hub Support and Technical Assistance (OTASO Section 6.1) 3

D) Workstream 2: National-Level Knowledge Sharing, Visibility, and Identification of Gaps (OTASO Section 6.2) 5

E) Workstream 3: National AI Deployment Support (OTASO Section 6.3) 5

F) Workstream 4: Industry and Philanthropy Engagement (OTASO Section 6.4) 6

G) Workstream 6: AI-Ready Catalyst Award Competitions (OTASO Section 6.6) 6

H) Workstream 7: Documentation and Reporting of Progress Towards Technical Milestones, Performance Metrics, and Key Learnings (OTASO Section 6.7) 8

I) Proposal Budget and Budget Justification (OTASO Section 7.3) 8

J) Conflicts of Interest (OTASO Section 7.6) 10

K) Supplemental Material (OTASO Section 7.2) 11

L) Letters of Collaboration/Commitment (OTASO Sections 7.2 and 7.5) 12

M) Page Limits and Formatting (OTASO Section 7.2) 13

N) Merit Review: Proposal Evaluation and Oral Presentations (OTASO Sections 8, 9, and 11) 14

O) Miscellaneous 14

A) Submitting to both the National Lead and State/Territory Coordination Hubs (OTASO and Solicitation NSF 26-508)

1. Can an organization participate in more than one proposal for the National Lead?

   Yes, this is allowable.

2. Can a partner for the National Lead also be a partner on a State/Territory Coordination Hub? Additionally, does the prohibition on National Lead participation in Coordination Hub awards apply to individual consultants, or only to the lead organization and formal partner/subcontractor organizations?

   Potential conflicts of interest and eligibility considerations will be based on the specific facts and circumstances presented and will be determined on a case-by-case basis at time of award. If changes need to be made to partners or contractors, this can be negotiated and changes made prior to award.

3. If an organization submits a proposal for the National Lead organization, will it also be considered for a Coordination Hub if interested and not selected for the National Lead organization?

   An organization not selected as National Lead may apply to future rounds of the State/Territory Coordination Hubs solicitation via a separate proposal application.

B) Characteristics of a Highly Qualified Organization (OTASO Section 5.1)

4. The OTASO specifies the National Lead role must commit no less than 75% full-time effort. Would the contract be satisfied by two co-leads with a sum of FTE greater than 75% (for example two co-leads at 50%)?

   No. Per the OTASO requirements, at minimum, the individual serving in the National Lead role (equivalent of the Principal Investigator in NSF Financial Assistance Awards) must commit no less than 75% full-time effort (0.75 FTE) to the project. This means one individual at 75% FTE or more.

5. The OTASO states that teams must demonstrate commitment of key personnel. Is there a minimum/maximum number of Senior Key Personnel expected, or a rough range of how many staff should be considered key, along with any specific positions they should hold and the types of expertise they should have?

Proposers should assemble a leadership team that can effectively execute the workstreams outlined in the OTASO and is responsive to the evaluation guidelines outlined in Section 9.0, including national convening power and trusted, neutral stewardship. This will likely mean a mix of both high-level, convening expertise and AI implementation in key sectors such as workforce development and education. There is not a specified number of key personnel. However, proposers should balance commitment of personnel and operational agility (ability to make decisions and execute on a rapid timeline). In guiding determinations about key personnel, proposers should consider the language "Senior Key Personnel are individuals who are essential to the leadership, management, or technical execution of the proposed National Lead's scope of work."

6. The OTASO states that "as a pre-condition to the start of the award performance period, the awardee must stand up the National Lead organization." Does NSF expect proposers to have a fully operational program office and governance structure in place at the time of proposal submission, or may proposers present a detailed stand-up plan that would be executed upon selection and prior to performance start? Additionally, can proposers list key project roles as "to be hired" if they clearly describe the staffing plan, qualifications, recruitment timeline, and interim coverage?

   It is acceptable to present a stand-up plan to be executed upon selection. Additionally, it is allowable as part of the stand-up plan to list some of the roles as "to be hired". Note, however, that the stand-up plan will be assessed as part of the evaluation.

7. One of the characteristics required of the lead organization for the National Lead is "operational agility and the ability to stand up a semi-autonomous program unit." Please clarify what is meant by "semi-autonomous" and/or provide some specific examples of the authority the program team must have.

   The primary capability needed here is the ability to make decisions and execute on a rapid timeline without requiring significant layers of approval internal to an organization. However, an organization's internal capabilities may be leveraged where that makes sense to do so.

C) Workstream 1: State/Territory-level Coordination Hub Support and Technical Assistance (OTASO Section 6.1)

8. How many in-person events should proposers plan for in Year 1, including the annual Hub convening and outreach, to support travel cost estimation?

   Per the OTASO, the National Lead is responsible for one annual convening. Applicants may propose additional in person convenings.

9. Does the annual meeting need to be held at NSF headquarters or some other site designated by NSF, or will the lead organization determine the site of the annual convening?

The location of the Annual Convening will be decided jointly by the National Lead and NSF. For proposal budgeting purposes, proposers should choose a nominal location and design their budget accordingly.

10. May a single organization provide both the technology platform as well as serve as the National Lead?

    Yes, this is allowable.

11. As part of the requirement to "Create and Maintain Shared Resources", does NSF expect a specific platform/methodologies to be employed, or will that be left to the discretion of the National Lead in conjunction with Coordination Hubs?

    No, NSF is not mandating a specific platform.

12. With respect to the needs assessment/gap analysis, should the National Lead focus primarily on identifying the needs and capacity gaps of the State/Territory Coordination Hubs themselves, or should the gap analysis also assess the AI-readiness needs of the constituents and communities the hubs serve, such as businesses, workforce partners, educators, local governments, and community organizations?

    As stated in the OTASO, the needs assessment should "guide tailored support and enable effective implementation of AI readiness strategies. Assessments should surface state-specific needs and highlight common challenges that require national solutions." That said, the gap analysis will need to be scoped to a reasonable level of support in terms of the allocated budget.

13. What level of authority, if any, will the National Lead have regarding Coordination Hub participation in shared reporting, technical assistance activities, communities of practice, and performance metric alignment?

    Per NSF 26-508, State/Territory Coordination Hubs are required to work with the National Lead to ensure state priorities inform national strategies, approaches, and scaling and to submit performance metrics to track and report outcomes. In this sense, the requirement for cooperation between the State/Territory Coordination Hubs and the National Lead is written into both the State/Territory Coordination Hubs solicitation and the National Lead OTASO. Proposers for the National Lead OTASO should demonstrate preparedness for cooperation of this nature and scale.

14. Should proposers assume phased implementation and partial geographic coverage during early program years for the Coordination Hubs?

    Yes. Please see NSF 26-508: TechAccess: AI-Ready America | NSF - U.S. National Science Foundation for the State/Territory Coordination Hubs program structure and funding rounds.

15. Will the National Lead have access to proposals of the selected awardees for the State/Territory Coordination Hubs.

No, NSF proposal information is confidential. However, selected Hub teams are free to share materials directly with the National Lead.

D) Workstream 2: National-Level Knowledge Sharing, Visibility, and Identification of Gaps (OTASO Section 6.2)

16. Is the National Lead expected to host the public-facing tools and dashboards? Which accessibility, Section 508, and data-rights requirements apply to the National Lead?

    The National Lead will host the public-facing tools and dashboards. Public-facing tools must comply with applicable accessibility requirements, including Section 508, as applicable. Specific data-rights, privacy, and system requirements will be discussed with the selected OT awardee during negotiations.

17. With respect to "offering engagement opportunities" as part of Workstream 2, does NSF have any expectations as to the frequency or total number of these types of engagement opportunities (i.e., X webinars per month/quarter, etc.)?

    No, the National Lead should propose the specific schedule and frequency of engagement activities. This will ultimately be decided in partnership with NSF and will be informed in large part by the needs of the selected State/Territory Coordination Hub teams.

18. Is the National Lead expected to build and maintain a proprietary public-facing technology platform, or may the National Lead leverage existing platforms, tools, and infrastructure to meet Workstream 2 requirements?

    Applicants should propose an approach that meets the program needs.

E) Workstream 3: National AI Deployment Support (OTASO Section 6.3)

19. Is "National AI Deployment Support" intended primarily to mean practitioner expertise, training, advisory services, and surge support, or may proposers also include shared technical infrastructure such as secure AI sandboxes, cloud resources, data storage/management tools, prototyping environments, or reusable deployment templates? Should these infrastructure resources be addressed under Workstream 3, Workstream 4, or both?

    Shared technical infrastructure is allowable, but limited NSF funds are intended to be used for that purpose. Proposers can, however, obtain resource commitments from other sources.

20. Workstream 3 describes national AI deployment support as need-validated and demand-driven. Can NSF provide any guidance on the anticipated scale of this workstream in Year 1, including whether NSF envisions the AI Deployment Corps as a standing team, an on-call network of practitioners, or something else entirely?

    The size of this workstream will be unclear until a needs assessment is carried out. Proposing teams should consider the budget and time needed to lay the groundwork for this workstream in Year 1 and, if identified as a need, a larger effort would be put forward starting from Year 2. Also note that the OT will allow reallocation of funds, if budget is set aside for this or other efforts and then not needed.

21. Workstream 3 references practitioner training, skilling, and credentialing as potential activities. Does NSF anticipate the National Lead developing original training content, or primarily curating and connecting to existing training resources?

    As in the other workstreams, the primary role of the National Lead will be as a connector. Generally, if training content exists with respect to AI deployment support, then original content should not be developed. If, on the other hand, State/Territory Coordination Hubs identify training content as a gap in executing their local versions of AI Deployment Support, then the National Lead could decide to develop original content.

F) Workstream 4: Industry and Philanthropy Engagement (OTASO Section 6.4)

22. Does NSF have specific expectations regarding the scale, timing, measurement, and management of leveraged financial or in-kind contributions from industry and philanthropic partners?

    There is not a pre-determined way this support will be handled, but as outlined in the OTASO, the National Lead is expected to formalize partnerships and integrate contributions into program activities. Proposing teams should describe their intended approaches and NSF and Federal Partners will collaborate with the National Lead to negotiate and build out this workstream.

G) Workstream 6: AI-Ready Catalyst Award Competitions (OTASO Section 6.6)

23. What level of NSF access to the National Lead application-management and data systems is expected for oversight and research-security screening, and is a FedRAMP authorized environment required or preferred for sensitive applicant data?

As described in Sections 6.6 and 7.4 of the OTASO, NSF will not require access to the National Lead's application-management systems beyond what is necessary for oversight and research-security screening. Specific system access, data-handling, and information-sharing requirements will be negotiated with the selected organization prior to award.

The OTASO does not prescribe a specific hosting environment or require FedRAMP authorization. Proposers should describe their approach to securely managing sensitive applicant information in accordance with Section 7.4. Any additional security, privacy, or system requirements will be addressed during negotiations of the resulting OT agreement.

24. Will NSF provide the research-security screening criteria and the specific data elements to be captured during Catalyst Award competitions?

This will be determined at a later point, if/when the National Lead is responsible for an AI-Ready Catalyst Award Competition.

25. Can NSF provide an estimated annual funding range and anticipated volume of AI-Ready Catalyst Awards that may be administered by the National Lead during the period of performance?

NSF anticipates providing additional funds to support the Catalyst Awards, but at this time, NSF cannot provide an estimated annual funding range. Updates will be posted to the AI-Ready America initiative page and discussed with the National Lead once selected.

26. If the National Lead administers Catalyst Award Competitions, does NSF anticipate requiring the use of a government-provided platform, and what level of autonomy does the National Lead have over an award management platform?

NSF is not mandating a platform. Specific access requirements will be negotiated during award.

27. What is the expected number, scale, budget, and rough topic areas of Catalyst Award Competitions during Years 2–5, so proposers can budget adequately for competition administration infrastructure?

The National Lead is likely to start to run competitions starting in Year 2, and exact activities are to be determined. Teams, therefore, do not need to budget for this for Year 1. Teams should, however, budget for post-award activities with a set of Catalyst Competition Awardees for Year 1.

28. Does NSF anticipate the National Lead administering federal-style competitive reviews with formal merit review panels, or is NSF expecting more challenge-based innovation competitions with flexible review structures?

    The design and review process will be managed in partnership with NSF, and the expected scope of the National Lead's competition management responsibilities for the first 12 months will be defined during negotiations for this award. Note that the National Lead is not expected to run Catalyst Award Competitions in Year 1. However, the National Lead is welcome to propose other competition formats that could start in year 1.

H) Workstream 7: Documentation and Reporting of Progress Towards Technical Milestones, Performance Metrics, and Key Learnings (OTASO Section 6.7)

29. With respect to evaluators, does "independent" mean the evaluator needs to be outside of the contractor's organization or can the evaluation come from within the lead or partner organizations but not parts of the National Lead team?

    The proposing team must demonstrate that the evaluator(s) are independent and will be unbiased. The likely situation is that this should be from outside the lead or partners organizations, but the selected National Lead can negotiate this point with NSF.

30. Will NSF establish a common data and reporting infrastructure for Coordination Hubs to use directly, or is the National Lead expected to build and manage that infrastructure as part of Workstream 2 and Workstream 7 responsibilities?

    The National Lead will establish data reporting infrastructure, in collaboration with NSF and awarded Coordination Hubs.

I) Proposal Budget and Budget Justification (OTASO Section 7.3)

31. Should the Year-1 budget present fully burdened labor rates, or unbundled direct labor with separately stated fringe, overhead, indirect cost, and fee, given that the award will combine fixed-price and milestone-based payments?

    The budget should be submitted in accordance with Section 7.3. Proposers should provide sufficient detail to support meaningful evaluation of the proposed level of effort, including the budget categories and supporting information identified in Section 7.3.

32. Are GSA STARS III or other GSA schedule labor rates acceptable as a labor-rate basis or benchmark for the budget, recognizing that this Other Transaction is not placed on STARS III?

Proposers may use any reasonable basis for developing proposed labor rates and cost estimates. NSF is not requiring the use of any specific rate schedule. Proposed budgets will be evaluated in accordance with Section 9.3 and are subject to negotiation prior to award.

33. Are proposers expected to propose a milestone and payment schedule for the first 12 months, or will the payment structure be defined entirely during negotiations?

    Proposers are required to submit a budget with proposed payment structure for the first 12 months of award. The final budget and payment structure will be negotiated with the prospective awardee.

34. Is fee or profit expected in the budget, and what statutory fee limit, if any, applies under 42 U.S.C. 19116?

    Fee is not required but may be proposed in accordance with Section 7.3. Any proposed fee will be subject to negotiation and applicable statutory limitations.

35. Are organization stand-up costs that precede the performance period allowable, and should they appear in the Year-1 budget or be presented separately?

    Proposers should include costs necessary to establish and operate the National Lead organization. Specific treatment of stand-up activities, including timing and payment structure, will be addressed during negotiations with the selected organization.

36. Is setting up secure data infrastructure considered a pre-condition to the award?

    No. Costs associated with setting up a secure data infrastructure may be discussed during the negotiation period if NSF and reviewers have any concerns with the proposer's approach and capabilities.

37. Is the $5M per year an estimate, a target, or a ceiling for the Year-1 budget projection, and what cost realism baseline will NSF apply?

    The $5M annual amount identified is the anticipated annual funding level for this effort, subject to the availability of funds. Proposed budgets will be evaluated for realism, reasonableness, and alignment with the proposed approach and are subject to negotiation prior to award.

38. Is NSF planning to use the first 12-month budget submission as the same funding level for each of the subsequent years of the period of performance or will out year budgets be negotiated during OT execution?

    The Government intends to support the National Coordination Lead at $5M per year for the duration of the award.

39. Should the proposal budget include only planned subcontractors that are part of the proposed National Lead team and will perform defined Workstreams 1–7 activities during the first 12 months, while excluding future funds for Coordination Hubs, Catalyst Award

recipients, or other participating teams that may receive subawards/subcontracts after award?

The amount of $5M is for the lead organization and any subcontracts. The detailed budget for the first 12 months is needed for the lead and any subcontracts. The budget should not include funds that would be distributed to awardees as part of any competitions that the National Lead may run, such as the Catalyst Award Competitions.

40. In Section 7.3, detailed breakdown of costs for travel is to be provided for the first 12 months only. Will future years not require a detailed description of travel, or will NSF not directly support costs for travel in years 2-5, or does NSF not anticipate any travel beyond year 1?

    Proposers are required to outline their budget for the first 12 months of the award, for travel and all other sections of the budget.

41. In Section 4.0, does NSF anticipate annual renegotiation of work plans, milestones, and funding allocations as program priorities evolve?

    Yes, the budget and its associated milestones and workplans will be negotiated on an annual basis.

42. Is there an assigned-NSF budget excel file for proposal submissions?

    No.

43. In Section 4.0, does NSF have an anticipated split between fixed price and milestone payments?

    No.

44. In Section 7.3, under “Subcontracts,” refers to “activities under each of the workstreams listed in section 7.” Please confirm whether this reference is intended to refer to the workstreams listed in Section 6.

    This is written correctly. It is referring to the workstreams and activities that applicants include in their proposals.

J) Conflicts of Interest (OTASO Section 7.6)

45. Where should the Conflict-of-Interest statement be included for submission?

    The Conflict-of-Interest Statement should be provided as supplementary material to the proposal narrative and does not count towards the 20-page proposal limit.

46. For purposes of conflict-of-interest restrictions, how does NSF define organizational affiliation within complex corporate structures, subsidiaries, and affiliated entities?

    NSF has not established a specific definition of organizational affiliation for purposes of this solicitation. Proposers are responsible for identifying and disclosing any actual, potential, or apparent organizational conflicts of interest, including those involving parent organizations, subsidiaries, affiliates, or other entities whose relationships could affect the organization's ability to perform the National Lead role in an impartial manner. NSF will evaluate disclosed conflicts on a case-by-case basis.

47. Is there a mechanism for the National Lead to request a conflict-of-interest waiver for a specific, clearly ring-fenced commercial relationship, subject to NSF approval and ongoing monitoring?

    Proposers may identify potential organizational conflicts of interest and propose mitigation approaches as part of their proposal. NSF will evaluate disclosed conflicts and proposed mitigation measures on a case-by-case basis. The acceptability of any mitigation approach, including organizational firewalls or other measures, will depend on the specific facts and circumstances involved.

48. Could any aspects of the OTASO's scope of work give rise to an organizational conflict-of-interest for prospective bidders? Further, would performing this effort limit the awardee's eligibility for future related work?

    NSF has not identified any organizational conflicts of interest that would automatically preclude participation beyond the eligibility restrictions expressly stated in the OTASO. As described in Section 5.0, an organization selected as the National Lead will be prohibited, for the duration of the award, from serving as a lead or partner on any State/Territory Coordination Hub awards or future Coordination Hub proposal submissions and from participating as an applicant in AI-Ready Catalyst Award Competitions. NSF reserves the right to address additional conflict-of-interest considerations during proposal evaluation, negotiations, and award administration.

K) Supplemental Material (OTASO Section 7.2)

49. For Appendix A (Biosketches), is there a preferred template?

    No.

50. For Appendix B (Partnerships), the OTASO requires "a partner commitment summary-table". Please confirm that there is no page limit for the partner commitment summary-table.

    This is correct. Note, however, the overall guidance on proposal preparation that states that "Proposals for the OT contract shall be direct and concise".

51. For Appendix C (Capability to Execute an Other Transaction (OT) Award), a letter is required for submission as noted "from the Authorized Organizational Representative confirming the organization's ability to execute an OT." Is there a page limit for the required letter?

    There is no page limit. Note, however, the overall guidance on proposal preparation that states that "Proposals for the OT contract shall be direct and concise." The ability to execute an OT should be described within the proposal narrative. The purpose of this letter is for the lead organization to formally confirm capability and willingness to work within the OT mechanism.

52. For Appendix D (Demonstrated Ability to Execute Workstreams), can any of the 3 example projects be from a subcontractor on the proposed team?

    Yes.

53. For Appendix D (Demonstrated Ability to Execute Workstreams), the OTASO requires the submission of "up to three example projects that demonstrate the organization's capabilities and will facilitate NSF's review, evaluation, and selection process described in this solutions offering. Please confirm that the three pages of example projects (one per project) are excluded from the 20-page limit identified for the proposal narrative.

    Yes, this is correct.

54. For Appendix D (Demonstrated Ability to Execute Workstreams), should only come from the lead organization or could come from any of the key partners in the proposal team?

    Example projects that demonstrate the team's ability to execute the required workstreams can come from any partner in the proposing team whose expertise will be key to carrying out those workstream responsibilities.

L) Letters of Collaboration/Commitment (OTASO Sections 7.2 and 7.5)

55. Under Supplemental Material, Appendix B, it says "Provide a Letters of collaboration/commitment from each partner (up to 0.5 pages for each)". Please clarify the formatting.

    The 0.5 page requirement is referring to the narrative component of the letter. Each letter itself can be on a separate page.

56. Should letters of collaboration/commitment follow the NSF PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.d.(iv) with suggested language "If the proposal submitted by Dr. [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] entitled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by NSF, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description. Or can we use our own language?

    No, OTASOs are not subject to the NSF PAPPG. It is governed by the Other Arrangements/Transactions Guide ("OA/T Guide").

57. What is the difference between the letters of collaboration/commitment in Section 7.2 and those in section 7.5?

    The OTASO distinguishes between letters of collaboration/commitment from subcontractors and letters of collaboration from partners. When an organization is listed as a subcontractor in the budget, a letter of commitment is required. That letter needs to describe the specific work the subcontractor will perform, why that organization is well-qualified for that role, and it must confirm that they have reviewed the OTASO and are prepared to ramp quickly to meet program needs. Partners listed in Component 3 provide letters of collaboration or commitment, and these letters are meant to affirm the roles and relationships that make up the broader National Lead team. These letters focus on the intent to collaborate and how the partner contributes to the overall coordination effort. Some organizations may appear in both roles — as a subcontractor and as a partner — and when that is the case, they would submit both types of letters, each serving its appropriate function. Together, these materials help clarify the full team structure, showing how responsibilities and relationships are organized to support the National Lead.

M) Page Limits and Formatting (OTASO Section 7.2)

58. Please confirm that the 20-page narrative limit comprises only Section 7.2 Components 1 to 4, and that all other components (e.g. Title Page, Budget and Budget Justification, and Letters of Commitment) are excluded from the 20-page limit.

    Yes, this is correct. However, note that most of the other sections have their own page limits.

59. Do tables, graphs, and the organizational chart count toward the page limit for the narrative portion (Section 7.2, Components 1-4)?

    Yes, they count towards the 20-page limit.

60. Beyond letter size, 1-inch margins, 11-point text, and 10-point tables and graphs, are there constraints on font family, single or double spaced, and may headers, footers, footnotes, and citations use a smaller point size?

    No additional constraints beyond those noted are listed in the OTASO. However, proposers are advised to select an easily readable font family. Use of a small font size makes it difficult for reviewers to read the proposal; consequently, the use of small fonts not in compliance with the above guidelines may be grounds for NSF to return the proposal without review.

61. What is the maximum email and attachment size – is a single combined PDF preferred over separate files, and is there a required file-naming convention?

    Proposers should submit a single PDF unless they are limited by file size. The maximum file size that can be emailed to an NSF inbox is between 10-25 MB.

N) Merit Review: Proposal Evaluation and Oral Presentations (OTASO Sections 8, 9, and 11)

62. Are there any evaluation elements from NSF's PAPPG that carry into this solicitation, including Broader Impact and Intellectual Merit?

    The OTASOs and OTs do not follow the PAPPG. Evaluation for this OTASO is described in "Section 9 - Evaluation Guidelines".

63. Will NSF share details about the oral presentation, including how criteria are weighted, composition of the evaluation team, and whether proposers will be permitted to present updated partnership commitments that differ from the written proposal?

    As described in the OTASO, proposals will be evaluated by NSF in collaboration with the AI-Ready America program federal partners, considering all three major evaluation criteria outlined in the OTASO. Details with respect to the oral presentations will be provided at least one week prior to oral presentations.

64. With respect to Major Criteria One (Organizational experience, Strengths, and Capabilities), will NSF evaluate organizational characteristics against the lead organization alone, or against the proposed team collectively, including subcontractors and consortium partners?

    Evaluation will be of the entire proposed team.

65. In Section 9.3, Budget Realism and Alignment- Title heading is missing "Major Criteria Three" – can NSF clarify if this was an accidental or an intentional omission?

    Yes. Section 9.3 should be titled 'Major Criteria Three: Budget Realism and Alignment.'

O) Miscellaneous

66. Please confirm that there is no incumbent National Coordination Lead and that this is the initial award under the TechAccess: AI-Ready America program.

    There is no incumbent Lead. The Lead will be selected through this OTASO.

67. Is a Letter of Intent or equivalent needed ahead of the July 23rd deadline to confirm intent to submit a proposal?

    No, there is no requirement to submit a Letter of Intent or any other documentation ahead of the July 23 proposal deadline.

68. For bidders that were unable to attend the June 11 webinar, will NSF share a link to the recording?

    Yes, the link is provided here and on the program's initiative page.

69. Beyond technical skills, the program aims to help Americans understand "Why AI?" and "When AI?". To what extent should the National Lead focus on the ethical, social, or "human-in-the-loop" aspects of AI literacy versus purely technical proficiency?

    This will be determined in coordination with the AI-Ready America program team and Coordination Hubs.

70. Is there a need or is it helpful to provide timelines/milestones past the first 12 months?

    The "Proposal Budget and Budget Justification" (OTASO section 7.3) should focus only on the timeline and milestones for the first 12 months. "Component 2 – Work Plan, Milestones, and Performance Metrics" (OTASO section 7.2) may go beyond the first 12 months if needed, but the primary focus should be on the first 12 months. Other parts of the proposal should describe the proposing team's longer view—including "Component 1 – Vision and Approach to Workstreams" (OTASO section 7.2)—but are unlikely to include extensive descriptions of timelines and milestones.

71. Beyond the initial five-year commitment, what role does the NSF expect the National Lead to play in transitioning the coordination infrastructure to a self-sustaining model supported by the partners identified in the resource mobilization plan?

    The continued need for this entity will be assessed as the program progresses.