FLOATING WIND JOINT INDUSTRY PROGRAMME S3P5

Clarification Question Responses

In-Situ Major Component Replacement Innovation Competition (IMRCI) Project

October 2026



#	Type	Question	Response
1	Project Specific	Scope – floating only. Section 2 of the ITT assumes applicability to both fixed-bottom and floating offshore wind, while the Criterion 2 description refers to fixed-bottom and/or floating. Could you confirm whether a solution developed specifically for floating wind turbines is eligible, and how a floating-only scope would be assessed?	Yes, a solution developed specifically for floating offshore wind is eligible. One purpose of this ITT is to understand the applicability of different concepts and where they fit within the market.
2	Project Specific	Patented technology. If a contractor's existing patented technology is used in the project, Condition 39.2(b) gives the Carbon Trust a royalty-free licence to use it for "Exploiting the Results", which Condition 1 defines as any commercial use, including outside the Floating Wind JIP. (a) Does this mean the Carbon Trust and the JIP Participants could use the contractor's patented technology commercially, without paying royalties? (b) Would the Carbon Trust accept an amendment in Annex A of the Tender Certificate limiting the licence to use within the JIP, so that any commercial use of the patented technology requires a separate licence agreement?	(a) The Carbon Trust intends to secure rights to use the project reports and results, not a general right to commercialise the contractor's existing patented technology. The aim is to understand the technology and accelerate its development. (b) The current contract conditions are standard FLWJIP terms and are not tailored specifically to technology innovators. Bidders should set out any proposed amendment to Condition 39.2(b) in Annex A of the Tender Certificate. Any amendment would require the Carbon Trust's review and express agreement.

3	Project Specific	Could you elaborate on the target audience for this tender: is a product owner/technology developer expected to compete?	FLWJIP comprises offshore wind developers, rather than necessarily the product owners or technology developers referred to in the question.
4	Project Specific	Section 2 states that bidders should assume applicability to both fixed-bottom and floating offshore wind, while Section 7 - Criterion 2, referring to applicability, states “across fixed-bottom and/or floating offshore wind”. Would a solution primarily developed for one category be considered fully aligned (where its wider applicability is addressed but not demonstrated) with the tender (criteria)?	Yes, a solution primarily developed for either fixed-bottom or floating offshore wind is eligible, consistent with the response to Question 1. Bidders should clearly describe its intended application, supporting evidence and limitations, and distinguish demonstrated capability from potential wider applicability.
5	Project Specific	The ITT states that emphasis will be placed on higher-TRL solutions and concepts capable of reaching commercial maturity within approximately 5–7 years. Is there a minimum technology maturity or indicative TRL range expected for each of the three technology areas?	No minimum TRL is specified, but higher-TRL solutions with a credible route to commercial maturity within approximately 5–7 years are prioritised. Bidders should justify their current TRL with development and testing evidence and outline remaining validation and milestones.
6	Project Specific	Could you elaborate on the level of admissible, and/or desired, Innovation in contrast to potential TRL requirements; is there place for undemonstrated low TRL innovations augmenting higher TRL solutions?	Lower-TRL innovations may be proposed as enhancements to higher-TRL solutions, provided the overall concept retains a credible pathway to commercial maturity within approximately 5–7 years. Bidders should distinguish demonstrated capabilities from unproven innovations.

			Where delivery depends on an undemonstrated element, its effect on the overall solution's maturity and development timeline should be clearly justified.
7	Project Specific	Could you give an indication of the expected Scope of proof and demonstration level of the solution – also in light of the previous performed MCR studies.	The scope is solution-specific technical de-risking, not another broad MCR feasibility study. Bidders should summarise existing evidence and propose analysis proportionate to maturity and key uncertainties. WP2 may include limited early-stage validation; full physical or offshore demonstrations are excluded. Outputs should strengthen confidence in technical viability and identify testing, resources and milestones for future demonstration and deployment.
8	Project Specific	Will scope and/or outputs from previous FLWJIP MCR work—including the OMCR Alpha study—be made available to bidders or selected Solution Providers, and should proposals assume the assessed concepts, and evaluations as a the technical baseline?	No. Previous FLWJIP MCR outputs, including the OMCR Alpha study, will not be made available. Proposals should be self-contained and should not assume those concepts or evaluations as the technical baseline.
9	Project Specific	What turbine, floater, environmental, load or interface data should selected Solution Providers assume will be made available by Carbon Trust/FLWJIP Partners for WP1 activities? Should bidders assume that all data required for their proposed analysis must otherwise be provided by the bidder/consortium?	As set out in Section 5, the Carbon Trust/FLWJIP Partners may provide some relevant data and assumptions, subject to availability and confidentiality requirements; no specific turbine, floater, environmental, load or interface datasets are guaranteed. Bidders should identify the data needed for WP1 and explain how they will obtain it, including any third-party agreements, or justify alternative assumptions. Proposals should not rely on unconfirmed Partner or OEM data access.

10	Project Specific	ITT Section 3.2 states that the Bid *"should provide a clear description of the proposed MCR technology, its current state of maturity etc."* As we understand it, this means that we are required to disclose sensitive details about our technology to OWA and the JIP Partners without an NDA being in place.	Bidders should provide sufficient information to explain the technology, its maturity and proposed approach, without disclosing sensitive proprietary details they are not comfortable sharing without an NDA. The Carbon Trust does not intend to disclose detailed information outside the project.
11	Project Specific	**Engagement with WTG OEM's -** 1. Do you expect Bidders to have close contact/collaboration with WTG OEMs ? If a Bidder does not have any such contact with a WTG OEM will this lead to a lower evaluation (all other things being equal?)? 2. For a commercial MCR system to be able to function on new turbines (i.e. still within warranty) the system design and operation will require WTG OEM data and cooperation. Do you agree with this assumption and if so how will you assess this long-term requirement in the marking criteria? 3. Will WTG OEM representatives have an input to the bid assessment? 4. Will Carbon Trust and/or the FLWJIP Partners assist successful solution providers in getting collaboration/data from WTG OEMs during work on the project?	1. OEM collaboration is beneficial but not essential. Bidders should outline existing engagement and any gaps, demonstrating technical viability and a credible delivery pathway. 2. WTG OEMs have been approached and have expressed interest this project. Where possible, bidders should address OEM data, interface and warranty dependencies, cooperation needs and risks against the published maturity, deployment and proposed-work criteria. OEM approval should not be assumed. 3. The ITT identifies the Carbon Trust and FLWJIP Partners as evaluators. An independent technical consultant has also been appointed for the duration of the project with strong links to WTG OEMs. 4. See Question 9, OEM cooperation and data access should not be assumed. Bidders should identify the support needed and their approach if access is unavailable.
12	Project Specific	**Applicable to current and next generation WTGs**	The project aims to support current and next-generation WTGs and understand where each technology is most applicable. Bidders

		Is it a requirement that the proposed MCR solution is applicable to both current and next generation WTGs? Will a bidder be marked down if the solution only applies to either current or future?	should specify the turbine sizes and architectures covered, supporting evidence, limitations and adaptations needed for wider applicability. Assessment will follow the published criteria.
13	Project Specific	**Total funds available** 1. Please confirm our understanding that the total funding of £276k is to be split (maybe in non equal shares) between four successful bids 2. Our bid will be tailored to focus on key areas only in order to stay within a specified budget (i.e. we are at a stage where, with suitable funding we could ramp up significant levels of work in excess of the stated budget). Can you give any guidance on what level of budget we should aim for? (on the understanding that you intend to select four schemes).	1. Yes, the total funding of £276,000 will be split between the four or less successful bids. 2. No additional funding is available at this stage.
14	Project Specific	**Work Packages** Please clarify the wording in WP1 and WP2 " Selected Solution Providers may receive support to ….." ? Is this support to be provided by Carbon Trust free of charge in addition to the project budget? i.e. should we assume these scopes of work will be provided and should not include them in our budget?	Bidders should include all costs for their proposed WP1 and WP2 activities. "May receive support" does not mean these activities will be provided free of charge beyond the project budget. The Carbon Trust may provide technical direction and project coordination, informed by FLWJIP Partners, but bidders should not rely on this support to deliver their proposed scope.

15	General	**Presentation style** Can the Appendices be a in a presentation style format?	Yes
16	Project Specific	**7 Months programme** Is 7 months a maximum time you are expecting? Is there a reason for this time period?	The seven-month programme aligns with our annual project timelines for delivery. Follow-on or future projects may be possible, but bidders should not rely on these.
17	Contracting	**Contract Conditions - non negotiable but any issues?** Please clarify the intention of 18.1. For context, we have a set of contractors (partners) who we have worked closely with for many years, all highly experienced in their field and knowledgeable about our equipment. We would expect a high proportion of the work under this project to be sub-contracted to these partners, with the coordination of work, project management and reporting undertaken by innovator personnel. All of these partners are either UK or EU based. Can you please confirm that in principle CT will consent to these sub-contracts and that this arrangement is fully acceptable under this competition.	Condition 18.1 is intended to require prior written consent for subcontracting, rather than prohibit it. Bidders should identify their proposed subcontractors, roles and scope of work for review. The lead contractor remains responsible for delivery and subcontractor compliance with the relevant contract obligations. Consent to the specific arrangement cannot be confirmed in advance.

carbontrust.com

+44 (0) 20 7170 7000

Whilst reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that the information contained within this publication is correct, the authors, the Carbon Trust, its agents, contractors and sub-contractors give no warranty and make no representation as to its accuracy and accept no liability for any errors or omissions. Any trademarks, service marks or logos used in this publication, and copyright in it, are the property of the Carbon Trust. Nothing in this publication shall be construed as granting any licence or right to use or reproduce any of the trademarks, service marks, logos, copyright or any proprietary information in any way without the Carbon Trust's prior written permission. The Carbon Trust enforces infringements of its intellectual property rights to the full extent permitted by law.

The Carbon Trust is a company limited by guarantee and registered in England and Wales under Company number 4190230 with its Registered Office at: Level 5, Arbor, 255 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9AX, UK

© The Carbon Trust 2026. All rights reserved.

Published in the UK: 2026