

2026-01-08 ITV Program Office Hours Transcript

Christi Pezzone 1:33

Welcome everybody who's logged in since we started a couple of minutes ago. We're just letting everybody get in from the lobby and get settled. We're going to get started in about a minute.

Let's go ahead and get started. I apologize for the pings that are going to come in if anyone joins after this. Welcome to the Industrial Technology Validation Program Opportunity Office Hours 3. My name is Christi Pezzone. I am the Deputy Director of ENERGYWERX, thanks so much for joining us here today.

Quick housekeeping notes, no AI bots are permitted. We will not be allowing them to join and if they do get joined, we will be removing them, so everyone is aware. Next slide please.

We will be using Slido for questions. You can either go to the link that was just dropped in the chat, or you can scan the QR code on the slide that you're seeing on your screen. That will take you to Slido where you can ask questions and review questions that other people have asked. If you are interested in an answer to the same question, please just give it a thumbs up. That will move it to the top of the screen so that your question is more likely to get answered. Please do not use the chat for questions. We will refer you back to Slido. In that case, we do ask that you reserve the chat feature for technical assistance questions only.

This webinar is being recorded and will be published on the [Opportunity Announcement website](#). We will also be posting the slides that are briefed.

As a quick reminder, applications close on **Thursday, January 29th, 2026 at 3:00 PM Eastern Time**. If you have any application issues, please reach out to info@energyworks.org. I'm going to turn it over to John O'Neill from the Office of Critical Minerals and Energy Innovation to begin our slides.

O'Neil, John 3:54

Thanks, Christi. Welcome everybody. Since this is our last opportunity to have an

Office Hours webinar and answer questions, I'm going to do my best to cover the material here quickly and assume that you guys have a high level awareness of the program already, then we'll hopefully leave plenty of time for open Q&A to make sure that any questions you guys have get answered. Next slide please.

I'm going to talk about the ITV program at a higher level. I'm going to give you some more of the specific details about this funding opportunity, which is a new addition to the program, then leave plenty of time for Q&A.

ITV is a program that is aimed at supporting the commercialization of innovative technologies in the industrial sector. We do this by focusing on field validation of these emerging technologies by working with pairs of technology developers and industrial host sites who apply jointly to test emerging technologies. We provide the third-party expertise and measurement and verification, or M&V analysis, through DOE's National Labs to validate the performance of new technologies when they are installed and operated in industrial host sites.

We share those results broadly with industry to help people make better informed decisions about the innovative technologies that they do or don't want to implement into their own facilities. Next slide please.

The goal of the program is, from our perspective, adoption of innovative commercial, innovative industrial technologies and the benefits of participating are split in between which role in the process you serve. If you are one of the technology developers, you have one of the technologies that you think can really improve operations for industrial partners. The benefit of this program is that you can go through and come out the other side with a report that has the DOE stamp of approval on it that says our technology saves this percent of energy based on this validation that we performed. It gives you more credibility with potential future customers. The process of working with a host site also gives you the opportunity to gain additional insights about what's useful to industrial customers and further develop and update your product as you go and mitigate risk for those future partners you work with on the host site side.

This is your opportunity to not only be at the cutting edge of installing these technologies that can give you a leg up on optimizing your operations relative to your competitors, but you can also go through this funding opportunity and get some help offsetting the cost of making those operational improvements. Next slide please.

M&V, or measurement and verification, is the cornerstone of the program. As I mentioned, we provide National Lab support to provide unbiased third-party validation of technology performance. Our goals in M&V are to be rigorous to reduce the uncertainty to what we consider a reasonable level and account for variations in operating conditions like runtime, weather, etc., all with the intent of providing a rigorous and quality product at the end that can give readers confidence in the veracity and the level of rigor of that that validation so they can make decisions about what to invest in in the future with more confidence. Next slide please.

The roles and responsibilities of technology developers and host sites are laid out here. I want to clarify that all parties are expected to be active and engaged participants throughout the process. This includes regular communication with each other, with us at DOE, and with the National Lab team that's going to be doing the M&V. All parties are expected to provide the relevant data and information, provide feedback, and raise problems with any validation as early as possible so that they can be resolved as quickly as possible. The expectation is that each party will live up to the financial commitments that they lay out in their cost share agreement.

On the technology developer side, their primary role is to provide the technology in a timely and operational fashion and throughout the process, help support the commissioning and installation of the technology, help monitor the performance of that piece of equipment, provide support as needed and where it's relevant, and help provide the relevant data.

On the host site side, they are going to be at the host site driving the installation, the management of the installation of the equipment, making sure it's put in place in the correct manner at whatever schedule they agree upon in the first Phase of this

project, and coordinating resources across the course of the project. Next slide please.

The application itself for this funding opportunity requires a joint application. In other words, a technology developer cannot apply just with information about the technology that they have and how great it is and how much it can save a potential industrial partner. A technology developer and a host site must apply together.

Obviously, there is one application portal, one organization is going to be the one clicking send on the application, but the expectation is that both parties are involved in developing the content for that entire application. And as additional safeguard to ensure that both parties are fully bought in, if it's the technology developer submitting the application, the host site is expected to provide a letter of commitment, and vice versa. If it's the host site, the technology developer is expected to provide documentation that verifies their understanding and commitment to the terms of this program.

We are casting a wide net in terms of the technologies that we're interested in, but what we want to emphasize is this technology must be ready for installation and evaluation in an industrial context. That means we're not looking for pre-prototype or conceptual phase of technology development. This should be ready to be installed and tested in an industrial setting and ready to stand up to the rigors of the of an industrial context.

Technologies must fit into one of the categories outlined below. Pre- or early-commercial are straightforward, but it is worth clarifying what we mean when we say new applications. That is for technologies that are well commercialized and deployed, but in different cases or different sectors. Some new applications of already well commercialized technologies and then underutilized, these are commercialized technologies in other markets, but not very highly adopted here in the United States. That is what we mean by those two, because of this range of technology readiness levels from pre commercial to underutilized, there's no specific scale or size requirement.

We may award some projects that are full scale, such as permanent installations and others that might be partial scale side stream type installations that may be temporary installations that are first of kind validations. The host sites should be industrial sites, and what we mean by that is manufacturing facilities, water and wastewater treatment plants and data centers. A whole range of different types of organizations can serve the function of a technology developer. One point of clarification though, DOE National Labs are not eligible to apply for this opportunity.

There's quite a lot of detail on this slide and it's worth spending a little bit of time on because there's a lot of detail here. The funding awards that we are providing as a new addition to the ITV Program are broken into 3 phases, each of those 3 phases has a particular amount of financial award that we can provide for the two different parties involved in this project.

The host site and the technology developer have different amounts that they are eligible to receive at each stage of the project's completion. The way that we've structured this is, once all the key milestones for each phase are completed to satisfaction, that is what triggers the payment of the awards for that phase. Once we achieve all of the milestones of the planning phase, then the \$10,000 to both the host site and the technology developer will be released at that point and moving forward for each of the additional phases.

I'll go through exactly what each phase means in more detail on subsequent slides, I don't want to spend too much time there, but ultimately the host site is eligible for an award of up to \$350,000 and the technology developer is eligible for an award up to \$50,000, \$400,000 total per project. I will also point out that while this is the amount that DOE through ENERGYWERX will pay to each of the parties, we have no input or influence into what the specific nature of the relationship is between the host site and the technology developer.

In other words, that relationship may be one of customer-vendor, where a host site is buying a piece of equipment from the technology developer. If that's the case, that's perfectly fine, but we are not going to modify the terms of our agreement and who we pay that award amount to, even if some of that money ultimately goes from the host site to the technology developer, there's certainly no requirement for that.

We may have a customer vendor relationship like that, or we may have something that looks more like a leasing of a particular technology, this relationship is not something that DOE gets particularly involved in and is up to the host site and the technology developer to figure out on their own.

It is worth pointing out that for the installation phase, we require a 50% cost share. For the installation costs including equipment costs, labor costs, there are more details in the [Opportunity Page](#) on what exactly can be counted towards cost share.

The expectation is that that 50% cost share would be provided by the project partners. There is no such cost share requirement for phase one and phase three. This process is ultimately that the goal of this project is to provide unbiased and transparent information about the performance of a technology when it is installed in an industrial facility. That means it requires the submission of data from the host site and the technology developer about that system's performance that will be provided directly to DOE and the National Lab team that will be supporting this project. They will ultimately analyze that data, both baseline performance as well as post retrofit performance for inclusion in that final report on the that final validation report. There is no desire or intent to share anything that is confidential or sensitive.

However, it is important to recognize that there will be an expectation that raw data files, things like temperatures, pressures, flow rates that would be relevant to performing that analysis will be required to be submitted as a part of this project.

I talked about cost share already and we also talked about the expectation for active participation throughout the entire duration of the project. Let's move on to the next slide, please.

As I mentioned, each phase will have several milestones associated with it. When and only when those milestones are met and submitted to DOE will the award amount for that phase be released. In the first phase, once projects are accepted into the program, there is an onboarding interview that will take place with the Industrial Technologies Office, our office within DOE and with the LBNL or Lawrence Berkeley

National Lab team, that's going to be doing the M&V as a core as part of that onboarding interview. Moving forward, you will develop in conjunction with LBNL a full M&V plan which includes a budget and project timeline that will be the blueprint for the remaining time for the project.

Once that's settled on, all parties sign a participation agreement confirming commitment and understanding of the deadline and the financial commitments laid out in the M&V plan, that is what triggers the release of that first \$10,000 to the host site and the first \$10,000 to the technology developer. Each project will vary a little bit in timeline, but this first phase is probably expected to take one to three months in total. Next slide please.

Following that, we get into the installation phase. The host site is expected to provide any required data on the baseline system. Whatever technology is being replaced or upgraded, we need some data on how that initial system is performing. Then, the installation of the new technology is completed, and finally data is collected and provided to LBNL on the post retrofit performance of that new technology.

On the technology developer side, they're expected to provide any necessary equipment according to the agreed upon project timeline and be an active participant and support the installation and commissioning as relevant. Once those milestones have been met to satisfaction that triggers the award of up to \$300,000 for the host site and up to \$10,000 for the technology developer. The timeline for this one is going to have quite a bit of variance project to project. Our intent is that projects should be ready to install within no longer than a year of acceptance into the program. It may depend in some cases if there's a strong data collection process already in place and we already have sufficient, and a host site can already provide sufficient information for the baseline performance period. We may be able to skip that period of time and jump right to the installation phase and then collect additional data moving on past that, and that might be sufficient in other cases if we didn't necessarily have all of the information necessary.

It may be that we require a period of time, say six months of running the system as it currently exists, then installing the new technology and moving on to the post retrofit phase. This will depend on project to project, but sort of all told the goal is

for this in its entirety not to exceed 24 months and in many cases hopefully be much shorter than that. Next slide please.

Finally, the analysis phase. A lot of the technical work in this phase is done by the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. They will be taking the data provided in phase two, crunching the numbers and providing a draft of the M&V report that we intend to publish. The host site and technology developer are expected to review that report and provide any feedback and then ultimately sign off on the approval for publication of that final report.

We certainly aren't interested in sharing anything that would be damaging or business sensitive. That's why we have that review phase and ultimately, we won't put anything out unless we get approval from both parties. Once that's completed, the host site is eligible for up to \$40,000 or is eligible for \$40,000 and the technology developer is eligible for another \$30,000. This will also take one to three months depending. Next slide please.

This information is included in the application or in the [Opportunity Page](#). These are the four high level buckets of what we're looking for when we score these applications. We want technologies that are suitable for validation, impact of the technology, replicability of the technology and the impact or importance of participation in the program. Basically, what does participation in ITV do for the commercialization of that particular technology?

Here's a quick rundown of our key dates. This is obviously our third and final Office Hours. We are three weeks out from the close of the solicitation that closes at 3:00 PM Eastern, so not midnight. I just want to make sure that that's flagged. We want to make sure that there's time for any last-minute technical difficulties if you're having trouble submitting but keep that in mind that it might be a little bit earlier in the day than you're used to. In early 2026, exact timing is to be determined but we'll notify selected participants and begin negotiating those and holding those kickoff meetings. That is my last slide, if I'm not mistaken. With that, I think we can go ahead and jump into Q&A and as Christi mentioned up top, those slides will be available after the fact.

Christi Pezzone 24:58

Right. I'll give Grace the chance to pull everything up.

Grace Zona 25:07

Thank you, Christi. Just one moment.

O'Neil, John 25:12

I didn't do that quite as fast as I wanted to, but maybe that means I pre-empted some of the questions.

Grace Zona 25:12

The first question that we have, **are reductions in CO2 emissions and harmful pollutants metrics of interest?**

O'Neil, John 25:28

Good question. No is the answer to CO2 emissions. We are looking for operational improvements, things like energy and cost reductions, and water and waste reductions. This could even include things like productivity, improvements, quality improvements, things like that. But greenhouse gas emission reductions are not explicitly of interest in this opportunity.

Grace Zona 25:59

Perfect.

Does the budget share have to be \$350K for host site, and \$50K for technology developer? Can we change it in the budget table according to project workplan?

O'Neil, John 26:10

\$350K and \$50K is set. We won't change it from that breakdown. However, it may be that the technology developer and the host site have some relationship worked out where there's some exchange of funds between the two of them for purchase of equipment, for example. We don't get into that. We simply keep it at that high level breakdown that I showed on that table.

Grace Zona 26:47

Thank you. **If the tech developer devotes staff time to install/testing, can these hours (when properly documented) count as cost share provided by the host site?**

O'Neil, John 26:58

Yes, they can.

Grace Zona 27:00

Perfect. Thank you.

For the Multi-Org activities tab in the budget, should the milestones be identical for Host Site and Tech Dev but with different award/cost share levels?

O'Neil, John 27:14

Let's table this one and that that's a little bit in the weeds for me to answer live without pulling that particular document up now. We will provide a response to any questions that we punt on or that we don't have time to get to, we'll provide that after the fact and post them on the [website](#). Thank you for the question.

Grace Zona 27:39

Does the technology have to replace existing technology at the host site, or can this be technology the facility does not already have?

O'Neil, John 27:52

It doesn't have to be an improvement on existing technology. It can be a new piece of equipment, but what's important is that there is a quantifiable improvement that can be measured and there needs to be a baseline to measure against.

While that doesn't necessarily mean there is a replacement of two pieces of equipment, there needs to be a way to measure the performance of a process or a system before this technology was implemented and then after that technology was implemented. So there needs to be this before and after that we can compare.

Grace Zona 29:21

Thank you.

Is there an allowable indirect cost rate?

Christi Pezzone 29:28

All of the awards are a firm fixed price, so the price that you propose is the price that you get. You would just need to line item all the portions of your cost in that spreadsheet that's attached. But there aren't indirect costs or direct costs for this because it's a firm fixed price award.

Grace Zona 29:50

Awesome. Thank you, Christi.

Could you explain best practices for filling in the four tabs in the budget spreadsheet template? There seems to be some duplicative information requested.

O'Neil, John 30:03

I think again we'll pause on this one to answer afterwards as well. I will at least say that I would be as comprehensive as possible and err on the side of being more inclusive in information than not inclusive and leave it to us to sort through it. If you feel like you're being asked for the same information twice, then answer it twice and just make sure that we've got all the information we need.

Grace Zona 30:37

Can the award be used for a portion of a larger project / budget for the installation at the host site?

O'Neil, John 30:47

Yes. The amount that we provide isn't intended to have any limitation on the total cost of the project. However, there is the maximum cap that we will provide. This could be a much larger project, and this might be a smaller portion of the total project costs, but there is certainly nothing saying that that it needs to be a smaller project to fit within a certain size.

Grace Zona 31:24

Thank you.

Can you explain if a profit margin for the tech developer is allowed since they can act as a vendor to the host site? How would this be reported in the budget?

O'Neil, John 31:36

That is allowed. There's nothing that DOE does to provide any restrictions or guidance on what the relationship should be between the host site and the technology developer.

I will say how to report it in the budget. In the budget template you will list all the relevant costs that are incurred by either party for that installation phase. Once that has been done, we will reimburse for up to 50% of that for the cost share and up to the total of \$300K for the host site and \$10K for the technology developer, so you don't need to explicitly call out that you are making money or not, but you describe all of the relevant costs incurred. The cost for the host site could be \$100,000 for purchase of equipment from the technology developer and that's an eligible cost to list in that form and then we will tally up all those costs incurred and provide up to 50% of them.

Grace Zona 33:01

Awesome, thank you. **Can the host site and developer be the same?**

O'Neil, John 33:07

No, they cannot. We are looking to avoid both reality and the appearance of any potential conflicts of interest. The host site and technology developer should be different organizations.

Grace Zona 33:19

Thank you.

**When would awards be paid out after the award date in spring 2026?
(scheduling purposes)**

Christi Pezzone 33:28

All of the payments are milestone based. It's going to depend on the schedule for your project, and all payments are done in arrears, so after the milestone is completed.

O'Neil, John 33:40

Just to add a tiny bit more color, that first phase, the planning phase, is when you will define the timeline for the rest of the project. That will depend on a project-to-project basis exactly how long it's expected to take, but that will be a key part of those first couple of months involved in the program.

Grace Zona 34:03

Thank you.

Can a milestone have \$0 in gov award and cost share if it's just signing participation agreement and commitment to the program?

O'Neil, John 34:15

There might be confusion with this question. Signing the participation agreement happens during the first phase and in the first phase there is no requirement for cost share. That is purely milestone based. Once the milestone of holding the kickoff meeting, defining the M&V plan, and signing the participation agreement are completed, then that \$10,000 per host site and per technology developer is released and there's no cost share required for that. It's only phase two where cost share is required.

Grace Zona 34:58

Thank you, John.

Is leasing a space specifically to assemble components of the project an allowable cost?

O'Neil, John 35:07

That's a good question. Yes, but there is some more detailed language on the [Opportunity Page](#) and some links to relevant cost share. However, we can confirm that in the follow up answers that we post, we'll make sure that we've got that right.

Grace Zona 35:34

Awesome. Thank you. **In the first tab of the budget template, how detailed**

should the itemized cost description be? Can costs like “equipment” be bundled?

O’Neil, John 35:45

You should not provide one line that says “equipment”. There should be more details than that. I think it's a little bit hard to say without a particular example to talk through, but we should have some clarity on what specifically is being purchased and for what amount we would not be very pleased to see one single line for equipment included in there.

Grace Zona 36:17

Thank you.

Can the baseline data be from a different site?

O’Neil, John 36:23

No. There are too many variables. Even if processes are similar and seemingly identical, there are still differences from site to site that would warrant the statistical rigor of the M&V process moot, and they would have to be at the same facility.

Grace Zona 36:47

Perfect.

**How should we go about reporting and documenting staff time for cost share?
What are allowable methods and rates?**

O’Neil, John 36:57

That's another one I don't have a good specific answer to right now. We can get a follow up on that one. I believe that's something we already have linked in the [Opportunity description](#), but we'll make sure of that.

Grace Zona 37:14

Thanks.

Great program! As you consider selecting an application for funding, what are your top three priorities? What is your top priority? Thank you for your help!

O’Neil, John 37:25

On one of the later slides that I shared, and also laid out on the [Opportunity Page](#), there are those four criteria that we're looking at and you can see the relative weighting of those. It's the **suitability for validation**; can we confidently do a statistically rigorous and verifiable validation project?

It's the **replicability** of that project or of that technology, basically how far and wide and how many facilities is that relevant to across the industrial sector.

It is also the **technology impact**, how big of a difference in performance is this technology relevant or relative to an incumbent process or technology?

Finally, we're also looking at the **scale of the impact** that participation in the ITV program specifically will have, such as the impact on funding and enabling these projects to happen, the impact on the validation itself in terms of helping the technology developer further commercialize their product.

That's all laid out in more detail than I just provided but look for those four criteria as our priorities.

Grace Zona 38:49

Thank you. This is kind of the same question, but I'm going to read it for transcription purposes. **What are the top 3 or 4 metrics that will have the most impact for project evaluations?**

O'Neil, John 39:01

Yep, same response as above.

Grace Zona 39:03

Perfect.

Our testing partner may not be able to participate. We have an affordable hydroelectric system. Is there anything ITV can suggest to finding a testing location?

O'Neil, John 39:14

Absolutely. On the [Opportunity Page](#) we have a [Teaming Partner list](#). There is no

requirement for any organization to be a part of that [Teaming Partner list](#) to participate in the program, but this is provided as a means for technology developers to find potential host sites and vice versa. If you are interested in participating but don't have a partner lined up yet, you're welcome to put your information into that form. It will be included on the [Teaming Partner list](#).

There is no vetting process on DOE's side for the information that gets included there. We don't provide any endorsement or recommendation of any technologies or potential host sites that include their names on that list. But that is a good way to potentially get some additional leads if you are looking for a partner.

Grace Zona 40:13

Thank you, John.

How do you define underutilized? Are Greenfield installs acceptable?

O'Neil, John 40:45

There does need to be a before and after to compare to. If we're talking about a new facility that would only ever operate with the new technology and would not have a baseline to compare it to, that would not really be possible to do the analysis that we'd be looking to do for the M&V.

Grace Zona 41:24

Is the intent to install a permanent piece of equipment or can the equipment be smaller in scale for a pilot?

O'Neil, John 41:31

We would expect to have, depending on what we see in the applications, some of both of those awarded in in this opportunity.

Especially for things that fall more into the underutilized or new application space, we may be talking about a technology that is already very well defined, very well commercialized for other uses or in other markets. There may be a very high degree of confidence already from the host site's perspective. They may be willing to go straight to a large scale and permanent piece of equipment and certainly we would be interested in those if that's certainly valid application.

Similarly, it's also perfectly valid to have a side stream installation or a small-scale pilot, provided that's still reflective of the operating conditions of the industrial facility. We could have a mix of both of those.

Grace Zona 42:45

Awesome.

Can the host site and developer be similar entities? with common ownership?

O'Neil, John 42:51

This one is pretty context specific. As I said before, the host site and developer should be two independent organizations. We don't want there to be reality or appearance of conflict of interest. The host sites and technology developers should be different organizations. They could be similar entities, but probably not on the common ownership side of things. If they operate independently, I think that would be different, but they should be different independent organizations.

Grace Zona 43:39

Perfect.

Can we make a proposal with multiple host sites?

O'Neil, John 43:44

Yes you absolutely can. It's not necessarily what I'd recommend, we would not award the same technology or a substantially similar technology for two different projects, though. The goal is to test numerous different projects or different technologies, not the same technology multiple times.

With that in mind, it's going to be worth your time to focus on one application and one partnership that you think has a really high degree of success or high likelihood of success, and focus your efforts on that rather than spreading your effort across multiple applications, because we'd only award one of them ultimately.

Grace Zona 44:35

How many projects do you plan on selecting?

O'Neil, John 44:39

Good question. We will award 8 to 10, but it depends on the size of the projects and whether they're large enough projects to meet the full \$400,000 limit.

But, 8-10 is what we're thinking.

Grace Zona 44:58

Awesome.

We have contacted the applicable test facilities on the list. We have contacted other entities but since late in the process any suggestions to find a partner?

O'Neil, John 45:11

What we're doing as a program to support this is the [Teaming Partner list](#). I don't have any other specific recommendations for finding somebody.

That would ultimately be up to the technology developers and host sites to find someone.

Grace Zona 45:34

Thank you. I'm going to read these together because it's a two-part question.

Is it acceptable to validate the technology using smaller-size products processed on full commercial manufacturing equipment (1/2) rather than full commercial-size products, when the smaller format still represents the same process & performance but keeps costs within Phase II budget? 2/2

O'Neil, John 46:08

This feels somewhat specific to a particular application or a particular potential project. I'll go back to what I was saying before that we fully expect there to be a range of scales of technology readiness and size of projects from pilot scale versus larger scale permanent installations.

The question here is a little bit different than that, but what's ultimately important is you should be prepared to justify or defend in such an application why and how the smaller size products are reflective of and representative of the larger scale process and why it's reasonable to extrapolate results from that validation to a larger scale system.

Grace Zona 47:19

Awesome, thank you.

Do the \$300K and \$10K installation include the 50% cost share or is the amounts received from doe

O'Neil, John 47:28

That's a good question. That is the amount that DOE will pay. Say the costs incurred in total for the project are \$620,000, then DOE would provide up to \$310,000 of that. 50% of the 300 and the 10 are 50%, not entirely. There's a cleaner way to respond to that, but I think you get my gist.

Grace Zona 48:23

Gratefully, there are a few universities that have offered to be a host site. Are they considered to be industrial in this case?

O'Neil, John 48:33

A university is generally not what we'd consider an industrial facility. Perhaps there are some edge cases where a university has a unique situation. But generally no, unless it meets the other requirements.

Grace Zona 48:57

Thank you.

Can a municipal utility be considered as a host?

O'Neil, John 49:02

I believe the answer is no, but we will follow up on this question in the Q&A responses.

Grace Zona 49:22

The presentation stated early 2026 selected participants will be notified. Approximately when is the award announcement?

O'Neil, John 49:31

I am not going to go on record to state any dates. We don't know definitively, but we have an idea internally, but we probably won't answer that one right now.

Grace Zona 49:45

Would a business park or industrial park be considered industrial site?

O'Neil, John 49:51

I could imagine an industrial park being a an industrial site, if we're talking about, I'm making a bit of an assumption here, but I assume the question is if it's if it's a system that perhaps provides a utility or something to numerous industrial facilities regionally, that that would be something that's eligible.

The big distinction is the industrial versus other applications. If we're talking about a business park, where it's providing some utility or something to several commercial office buildings for example, that's not something we'd be interested in. We're looking for applications in an industrial context.

Grace Zona 50:45

Thank you.

That is all that we have for right now.

Christi Pezzone 50:53

Perfect. I'll give it just a couple of seconds to see if anybody has any other questions.

Grace Zona 51:00

In prior presentation a Municipal Utility was mentioned acceptable as Industrial if they have commercial applications that they operate and are appropriate.

O'Neil, John 51:13

I'm going to say we'll confirm our earlier response exactly on that question. So municipal utility, if we are talking about municipal water or wastewater utility, absolutely that's something that would be relevant if we're talking about a power generating utility. I think the answer is no, but we will post the follow-ups and confirmations for this on the [Opportunity Page](#).

Just jumping to that next question on the [Opportunity Page](#). If you go to the Webinar Resources tab, there's Q&A responses from the previous [Office Hours](#) that you can reference as well as our generic [FAQ section](#) on that page.

Grace Zona 52:11

Thank you.

Can a state owned infrastructure be a host site for validation?

O'Neil, John 52:20

We don't care about the ownership structure of the facility, as long as it is an industrial facility located within the United States.

Grace Zona 52:32

Thank you. **Will the presentation be shared?**

O'Neil, John 52:37

Yes, it will. It might already be up there. Who knows? ENERGYWERX is pretty on top of things. Yes, it will be.

Grace Zona 52:46

Thank you. All right. That's it for now.

Christi Pezzone 52:51

Perfect. I will start to close us out and if any other questions come up, we'll jump over to those.

I wanted to thank everybody for participating in the ITV Office Hours 3 and I wanted to thank John and his team for being here and the ENERGYWERX team as always for coordinating.

Please remember that submissions are due no later than **Thursday, January 29th, 2026, at 3:00 PM Eastern Time**, and in the chat, you'll find important information regarding submission deadlines and who to contact if you have any issues.

Again, that's info@energyworks.org if you have any submissions issues. John, did you have any closing remarks you wanted to make?

O'Neil, John 53:33

Sure. Thank you all for your interest in the program. I'm really excited, we're getting close to closing things out. Really excited to start reviewing applications and moving forward with the program.

I'm looking forward to seeing what you all submit. Thanks for your interest and best of luck pulling your applications together.

Christi Pezzone 53:54

Perfect. Thank you, everyone. Have a great rest of your week.

O'Neil, John 53:57

Thanks all.