

**RFP-449622 MEDC 2026 Space Innovation Hub Q&A**

#	Questions	Answers
1	The RFP contains reference to the Michigan Space Strategic Plan, can you provide a link to this document?	Please see link to this document: <a href="https://www.michiganbusiness.org/globalassets/documents/defense/fy25-fy26-space-plan-campaign.pdf">https://www.michiganbusiness.org/globalassets/documents/defense/fy25-fy26-space-plan-campaign.pdf</a>
2	Section II-B states a maximum of 15% of awarded funds may be utilized for 'indirect grant expenses, administrative costs, or overhead costs.' Could the MEDC clarify whether direct program staff salaries (e.g., Hub Director, Program Managers) are considered direct grant expenses or fall within the 15% indirect/administrative cap? Additionally, does equipment purchased for shared Hub use (e.g., 3D printers, testing equipment) qualify as a direct program expense?	Direct program staff salaries are direct costs as they are directly related to the project (hub). Equipment purchased specifically for hub use would be a direct expense.
3	Section II-B states that 'awarded funds [are] not intended for traditional research applications and/or projects.' Could the MEDC clarify the distinction between (a) traditional research activities and (b) the applied commercialization, business support, and economic development activities envisioned for the Hub? Specifically, should Bidders assume that the Hub's primary mission is growing Michigan's space economy through business development, technology commercialization, and workforce services, rather than conducting or funding research programs?	The hub's primary mission is to "create and/or harness the requisite infrastructure, resources, and programmatic support to grow the existing Michigan space economy & space industrial base, providing support services to Michigan businesses at all stages/levels, as well as services for promoting professional growth for Michigan workforce and talent, with a statewide level of reach and impact." It is not to be used as the primary source for research projects but may support the translational or commercialization of research of any space related technology under development. How funding is to be allocated to provide commercialization or translational research projects is left to the respondent and should be described in the technical proposal.
4	Section II-B.2 notes strong preference for match funding. Could MEDC clarify: (a) whether in-kind contributions, such as donated facility access, equipment, or staff time from partner organizations, qualify as match; (b) whether federal grants secured by partner organizations, including Michigan-based universities, and dedicated to Hub activities qualify; (c) whether corporate partner cash contributions for Hub programming or infrastructure qualify; and (d) whether federal grants secured directly by the PA (e.g., EDA, SBA, DoD) qualify? Additionally, is there a minimum match ratio expected, or is match funding evaluated on a best-efforts basis?	a. In-kind contributions, such as donated facility access, equipment, or staff time from partner organizations, do not qualify as cash match funding. Cash match funding would be funding commitments provided by parties other than the MEDC/ODAI in support of this initiative.  Respondents are encouraged, however, to provide any/all information related to in-kind contribution commitment(s) as these may also support the strength/merits of the overall proposal.  b. This may qualify if the respondent can clearly demonstrate type and amount of funding to be dedicated to and/or accessed by the hub, for which hub activity, and can also provide a letter of commitment from the funding holder as such.  c. Yes, so long as respondent can clearly demonstrate type and amount of funding to be dedicated to the hub, for which hub activity, and can also provide a letter of commitment from the funding holder as such.  d. Yes, so long as respondent can clearly demonstrate type and amount of funding to be dedicated to the hub, for which hub activity, and can also provide a letter of commitment from the funding holder as such.  There is no minimum match ratio expected; respondent is encouraged to identify a level of match funding proportional to successful execution of efforts detailed in respondent's proposal, should award be made.
5	Section I-C.II references compliance with CUI, NISPOM, ITAR/EAR, and cybersecurity standards. (a) Should Bidders assume that CMMC Level 2 certification (or equivalent) will be required for the PA and/or central Hub facility? (b) Is the Hub expected to maintain any facility clearance, or will classified work remain outside the Hub's scope per the SCIF exclusion? (c) Should the Hub be prepared to manage ITAR-controlled technical data from defense tenants, and if so, does the MEDC have guidance on minimum cybersecurity infrastructure?	a. CMMC certification is not a requirement for eligibility of this RFP. Respondent is, however, expected to understand CMMC requirements based on proposed activities outlined in their respective proposal and as such, respondent should be prepared to address and adhere to said salient requirements, if any, related to CMMC certification or equivalent should an award be made.  b. Facility clearance and ability to conduct classified work is not an eligibility requirement of this RFP. Respondent is, however, expected to understand facility clearance requirements based on proposed activities outlined in their respective proposal and as such, respondent should be prepared to address and adhere to said salient requirements, if any, related to clearance and ability to conduct classified work should an award be made.  c. In general yes, this may be likely, however respondent is expected to understand ITAR requirements based on proposed activities outlined in their respective proposal and as such, respondent should be prepared to address and adhere to said salient requirements, if any, should an award be made. MEDC is not able to provide guidance on minimum cybersecurity infrastructure.
6	To what extent does MEDC expect applicants to propose a specific subsector focus (e.g., manufacturing, PNT, communications) versus a broader "whole of space economy" approach? Will proposals with a defined sector thesis be scored more favorably than those proposing a phased focus development process?	Respondents are encouraged to provide detail and rationale in terms of subsector focus area(s) chosen as targets in relation to this RFP, as well as chosen approach.
7	The RFP states the Hub "must at a minimum address defense and/or dual-use opportunities." What proportion of programming and services is expected to serve defense/dual-use versus fully commercial space activities? Is there a minimum threshold?	There is no minimum threshold for respondent's level of effort supporting defense/dual-use vs. fully commercial activities, however addressing defense and/or dual-use opportunities is a requirement.

8	Should the Hub's primary focus be serving Michigan-based space companies already operating in the state, or attracting out-of-state companies to establish a Michigan presence? What weighting does MEDC place on each?	The hub should create a core space-domain-enabling-and-activation asset that can provide key capabilities supporting industry development, and talent attraction and retention, and development of new technologies supporting the growth of Michigan's space economy. Industry development is inclusive of but not limited to supporting businesses already in Michigan, businesses looking to begin operations in Michigan (early stage/startup), as well as attracting businesses from outside of Michigan. The Hub would not be expected to lead business attraction initiatives for space, however as the hub would be a core space asset in the state, the Hub would be regarded as a trusted partner and Michigan space ecosystem SME in supporting attraction initiatives led by the MEDC and/or other entities within Michigan.
9	Is there a minimum number of distributed/spoke locations expected? Are there specific regions of Michigan (e.g., UP, West Michigan, Traverse City corridor) the Hub is expected to serve, or is geographic coverage left to the applicant's discretion?	There is no minimum number of locations determined. Respondents should describe they will, to the maximum extent practicable, serve the State of Michigan as a whole, by providing a thorough description of the location and structure of the Hub and how they would leverage/partner with other Michigan assets, organizations, and/or programs to help support entities that are both in relatively close proximity to, and remote, from the centralized physical hub, noting the need for the ability to maintain statewide reach and offerings via an adequate breadth and depth of services and resources.
10	The RFP requires the PA to be a Michigan-based nonprofit. In cases where the PA intends to engage a subcontractor organization to manage day-to-day Hub operations and programming, does MEDC require the Project Manager and key personnel to be employees of the PA, or may they be employed by the subcontracting organization?	Project Manager and key personnel are not required to be employees of the PA. Respondents are encouraged to propose a hub operating team and structure that best meets the requirements of the RFP.
11	The RFP scores "prior experience in economic development, innovation-based programming, and the space sector" as a single 20-point criterion. Can MEDC clarify the relative weighting within this criterion — specifically, how experience in economic development and innovation hub administration is weighted relative to direct space sector experience?	No.
12	The "deliverables, metrics and definition of success" criterion is weighted at 20 points. Does MEDC place greater emphasis on near-term economic outputs (jobs, follow-on funding, businesses supported) versus longer-term R&D or commercialization metrics? Is there a preferred balance between these in Year 1 targets?	Not necessarily.
13	Can the proposal be submitted by or awarded to an out-of-state for-profit partner if the Program Administrator will be a Michigan-based not-for-profit organization?	No.
14	Is the fee inclusive of all costs for the establishment of the hub (e.g. space/facilities, FF&E, equipment, programming, events, staffing, operation, etc.), or is the fee intended to fund the hub's operating costs only (e.g. programming, events, staffing)? If the latter, is there a separate funding mechanism for infrastructure and equipment?	Respondents' price proposal should be inclusive of all costs necessary in performing proposed activities within the technical narrative. Respondents are encouraged to detail where/how cash match will be utilized to support proposed activities.
15	Is the intent for the hub to be fully operational (e.g. facilities/equipment available, startups onsite in offices) at the start of the contract on September 1, or is there a ramping period beginning September 1 leading up to a later launch date?	As the hub is not yet established, it is not expected that the hub be fully operational at the start of the grant, if awarded. Respondents should clearly articulate the plan to launch, develop, and successfully operate the hub during the proposed period of performance, as well as in the future as a component of the required sustainability plan.
16	Page ii – Important Due Dates - Are all times Eastern Standard Time?	Yes.
17	Page ii – Email Subject Line – Will there only be two email submissions? Part 1, Technical Proposal and Part 2, Price Proposal?	Ideally, two email submissions (one for the Technical Proposal submission; and one for the Price Proposal submission with signed Attachment A included) - with subject line of each message labeled "X of 2", as appropriate. However, in the event Attachment A, or any other supplemental information your organization includes, is provided through an additional third email submission, please label the subject line of each submission with "X of 3", as appropriate. The goal is to ensure we receive each intended submission.
18	Page 2 – Section I, A. Purpose – Is the "Michigan Space Strategic Plan" referenced in this section the exact same document as the "Space Strategic Campaign Plan" completed in 2024 and described in Section 1, B. Background Statement and Objectives, or are these two separate plans?	These are the same document.

19	<p>Page 3 – Section I, A. Purpose – This section states that the MEDC is “seeking proposals from one or more bidders to establish the Michigan Space Innovation Hub,” while the NOTE in Section 1, B. Background Statement and Objectives states that “Only one (1) award is contemplated, and a multiple-award scenario is not expected,” even though the MEDC reserves the right to “award all or any part of this RFP and, based on what is in the best interest of the MEDC. Please clarify the intended award structure for this RFP:</p> <p>a. Is the primary intent to make a single award to one successful bidder for the establishment and operation of the Michigan Space Innovation Hub as a unified entity, or is a multiple-award scenario (e.g., awards to more than one bidder for distinct Hubs or complementary components) genuinely contemplated and possible?</p> <p>b. Regarding the reservation to “award all or any part of this RFP,” can the MEDC provide clear delineation or examples of what “parts” of the RFP might be awarded separately (beyond the general Section II Proposal Format structure)?</p> <p>c. Does the MEDC contemplate a scenario in which elements from two or more different proposals are combined or blended into a single awarded Hub (e.g., one bidder providing infrastructure while another handles programmatic services)?</p> <p>d. If a blended or partial-award approach is possible, would the MEDC assume responsibility for integration, coordination, and governance efforts across the selected components/bidders, or would that obligation fall to the awardee(s)?</p>	<p>a. A single award is contemplated  b. This scenario is not contemplated  c. No  d. This scenario is not contemplated</p>
20	<p>Page 4 – Section 1, C. Qualifications, I. Eligibility Requirements of the Program Administrator – What precise criteria defines a “Michigan-based non-profit organization” with “significant presence” for eligibility purposes (e.g. minimum percentage of operations, employees, or headquarters located in Michigan)?</p>	<p>Program Administrator must be a non-profit either headquartered in Michigan, or with an operation in Michigan with a significant Presence residing and managed within the State of Michigan. This presence could be defined by (but not limited to) percentage of operations, employees, amount of programming managed and deployed in the State of Michigan, etc. Respondents are encouraged to share how they feel they meet this general criteria.</p>
21	<p>Page 4 – Section 1, C. Qualifications, I. Eligibility Requirements of the Program Administrator – For the governance structure, what specific role(s) or level of participation does the MEDC/ODAI expect or require in the proposal Board of Directors or Advisory Committee (e.g., voting seats, ex-officio status, number of positions)?</p>	<p>Respondents are encouraged to propose level(s) of participation that the respondent would feel appropriate based on their overall proposed hub model, structure, and activities.</p>
22	<p>Page 4 – Section 1, C. Qualifications, II. Program Minimum Requirements – What minimum level of resource allocation or programming is required to satisfy the statement that “at a minimum the hub must address defense and/or dual-use opportunities for Michigan” while still allowing full commercial activities?</p>	<p>See response to question 7.</p>
23	<p>Page 6 – Section I, C. Qualifications, II. Program Minimum Requirements, Paragraph: Testing – Does the phrase “The Hub should maintain the ability to support the testing and/or certification of components or systems for flight” constitute a mandatory requirement, or is it merely recommended? If mandatory, which specific test capabilities (thermos-vacuum, vibration, radiation, etc.) must be physically present versus accessible via partners?</p>	<p>Respondents are encouraged to propose test capabilities and level of accessibility that are aligned with their overall effort and outcomes being proposed in the technical volume.</p> <p>In general and in relation to hub assets supporting technology testing, ability to support technology development inclusive of Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) 1-6 is desirable, however respondent may propose to support more advanced TRLs if they choose to do so.</p>
24	<p>Page 6 – Section I, C. Qualifications, II. Program Minimum Requirements, Paragraph: Compliance with laws and Regulations – Clarify “compliance with laws and regulations.</p>	<p>Awardee will be required to follow and be in compliance with all laws and regulations it is subject to.</p>
25	<p>Page 7 – Section I, D. Deliverables – Given the RFP’s acknowledgment that many meaningful outcomes typically occur at later stages of business development:</p> <p>a. How should bidders balance the requirement for specific, quantifiable first-year targets (especially lagging metrics like jobs created, patents, and commercialized products) with realistic expectations for a newly established Hub?</p> <p>b. Are leading-indicator metrics (e.g., number of businesses engaged, applications approved, events held, mentorship matches) acceptable as primary year-one targets, with lagging metrics proposed at more modest or ramping levels?</p>	<p>See response to question 12.</p>
26	<p>Page 9 – Section II, A. Technical Proposal, Paragraph 8. Project Staffing – Please provide more insight into MEDC Interview of Key Personnel Requirements and Process to deem unsatisfactory?</p>	<p>At the discretion of the MEDC, the MEDC may ask to interview staff to ensure competency, compatibility, experience, and anything else needed for successful cooperation.</p>
27	<p>Page 10 – Section II, B. Price Proposal – Is the 15% cap on indirect grant expenses, administrative costs, or overhead a strict, non-negotiable ceiling under all circumstances, or may it be exceeded with justification in the Price Proposal? Does the cap apply to the partners or sub-contracted entities?</p>	<p>A maximum of 15% of the awarded funds may be utilized for indirect grant expenses, administrative costs, or overhead costs. This percentage is reflective of the overall price proposal in its entirety and the components/line items therein.</p>
28	<p>Page 10 – Section II, B. Price Proposal - Does the 20-page limit apply to the Technical Proposal (as described in the exclusions and formatting instructions), or does the reference to the “full application package” mean that the combined Technical Proposal + Price Proposal (and any addenda) must collectively not exceed 20 pages?</p>	<p>The 20 page limit pertains to the Technical Proposal, and does not include nor apply to the cost proposal.</p>

29	<p>Mandatory vs. Optional Infrastructure and Services Language:  The RFP uses inconsistent modal verbs: "shall" (mandatory) for general office space, "may" (optional) for maker spaces (but then "shall" for how they must be shared if provided), "should" (recommended) for testing capabilities, and "may include (but is not limited to)" for overall physical infrastructure in Section A. Which specific physical infrastructure elements and services are truly mandatory (required to be provided directly by the Hub) versus optional or recommended?</p> <p>a. In particular: Is the provision of general office space (private and open) a strict requirement?  b. Are maker spaces (including the described Light Industrial, Component Assembly, and Mission Control areas) required, or may the bidder propose to provide none, limited versions, or rely entirely on partner facilities?  c. Is the ability to support specific testing/certification capabilities (e.g., thermo-vacuum, vibration, radiation, EMI/RF) mandatory, recommended, or acceptable via partnerships rather than on-site?</p>	<p>a. Respondent's proposal should include provision of general office space  b. Maker spaces are desired. Respondents are encouraged to propose to what degree, where, etc. they are able to align such capabilities with the hub, whether as a component of the PA's capabilities, or that of a partner.  c. This is desired. Respondents are encouraged to propose to what degree, where, etc. they are able to align such capabilities with the hub, whether as a component of the PA's capabilities, or that of a partner.</p>
30	<p>Will the grant be reimbursable or can we draw down quarterly in advance of spending?</p>	<p>Reimbursable, however additional terms may be discussed with awardee should an award be made.</p>
31	<p>Is there a subcontractor agreement template available for review?</p>	<p>There is no subcontractor agreement template.</p>
32	<p>[Organization] was formed under Michigan's Public Act 338 of 1974. While we are not strictly "nonprofit" in the same way a 501(c)(3) charity is, we operate as a non-profit. We promote economic growth, alleviate unemployment, and retain industry. Can you please provide guidance to whether we are a qualifying entity to submit for this proposal?</p>	<p>Respondents must be legal non-profits, but don't necessarily have to be organized under 501(c)(3).</p>