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FSSC Functional Overview

- Archive and distribution of LAT, GBM science products
- Maintenance and distribution of analysis SW
- All areas of user support
- GI program management
- Operations support; scheduling & planning
- Support of Fermi EPO
FSSC Status, Major Activities

• LAT instrument operations and planning support (Separate report)
• Software releases, helpdesk and archive activity (Separate report)
• User Support: Cycle 11 starts in August
  – Stage-II selections/awards to be finalized imminently
• Cycle 12: Fermi ROSES text changes need to be drafted in September timeframe
FSSC Status, Major Activities

• Scheduling and planning support
  – Some increased activity level due to solar array issue which necessitate modified survey strategies
  – Separate report

• Future of ToO implementation unclear
  – NRA language needed to reflect this?
EPO Activities

• FSSC presence at January AAS meetings
• FSSC organized Fermi presence at US Science & Engineering Festival
  – Washington DC convention center, BIG
• Goddard Science Jamboree (last week)
• RC continues to lead collaboration between Fermi scientists and art students at Maryland Institute College of Art.
• 10th launch anniversary themes
Cycle 11 Summary

- 139 proposals received, 42 selected (41 grants)
- Decreased response (~25%) \textit{wrt} Cy-8-10). Why?
  - 4 years of ~80% rejection rate?
  - Also note that a large fraction (~2/3) of that decrement is from collaboration institutions
- 30% approval rate, improvement \textit{wrt} last 4 or 5 years
- This rate equals the average for NASA missions but higher than ADAP, ATP
Cycle 11 Summary

• Funding levels:
  ➢ $2.5M: $2.3M new awards, $0.2M C9-10 obligations
  ➢ Dollar over subscription, 3.5X
  ➢ Average grant $55k (~constant over last 4 Cycles)

• Fermi is unique among mission GI programs in that we effectively set the oversubscription level by setting grant caps
  ➢ Question for For FUG: Are the current caps ($60k/$125k) an optimal strategy?
Cycle 11 Grants

- FY17 and FY18 awards are being processed as we speak
- Important point:
  - Improvement in selection rate plus ~4% increase in average grant were a result of decrease in obligations associated w/multi-year grants
138 proposals received, involving 380 individual investigators and 245 institutions

0 Large, 2 Progress Reports

$7.9M requested, $55k/yr average (excluding large)

Assuming $2.5M new funds (and 0.22$M obligation) $ oversubscription is ~3.5X

Joint programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Total Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRAO: (7/416)</td>
<td>(450-600 hrs, GBT, VLA, VLBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAO: (6/235)</td>
<td>(3-5% for various telescopes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERITAS: (1/???)</td>
<td>(120 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arecibo: (0/0)</td>
<td>(300 hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRAL:(1/200)</td>
<td>(300 ksec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected:

---------------------
42 selections, 41 grants
0 Large projects

selected joint programs:

----------------------
4 NRAO (no GBT)
4 NOAO
0 VERITAS
0 INTEGRAL
0 Arecibo

By Topic:

----------------
13 Egal, 7 GRB, 4 knova/GRB, 6, Pulsar, 3 SNR, 2 Nova, 2 methods, 1 TGF, 1 CR/solar, 1 Bubbles, 2 survey
GI Program History

Selection rate has been ~20-30% since Cycle 6.

~constant grant level since Cy8. Typical of NASA GO programs. Scientist at typical institution needs ~3 per year per postdoc.
• No joint program agreement with new Arecibo management
  ➢ 2, 1,0 proposals in Cy 9,10 &11 so need to remove from NRA
• GBT has so far continued despite split from NRAO. Long term is unclear.
• Also diminished interest in VERITAS JP (1 request)
• INTEGRAL joint program has not proven beneficial – discontinue?
  ➢ ~1 request per year, 0 total selections
Cycle 12

• Schedule: Feb. 20, 2019 proposal due date
  ➢ ~early May review, July stage-II awards
• Budgeting tbd, hopefully program can continue to select 30-40 programs
• No significant policy changes anticipated
  ➢ Clarify NRA language on ToOs, joint programs
  ➢ Unless FUG consensus on caps, other issues?
Peer Evaluation Committee Feedback

• The benefit of Large Projects in the current era of diminishing and uncertain budgets was questioned by some panelists
  ➢ Recurring argument was that one approval costs the same as 9 regular projects
  ➢ Also, the predominance of multi-wave monitoring campaigns and the value of extending beyond 10 years

• Recap, limit number of selections, eliminate or leave as is?