Cycle-2 Program, Cycle-3 Planning

Chris Shrader,
Fermi Science support Center
NASA/GSFC

Cycle-2 Program

- 199 proposals received, 80 selected
  - 79 grants
  - 8 “Progress Reports”, all passed
- 3 multi-year “Large Projects” selected
  - Down from 8 selections in Cycle-1
  - $1.5M in m-yr obligations from Cycle-1
- Average grants: $174k (large) $78k (regular)
- NRAO: ~650 hours awarded
  - ~50% of proposed amount
- NOAO: under-utilized resource
  - 3 requests, 1 award (24 hrs)

Cycle-2 Program

- No pointed observations (w/caveat)
  - Solar flare trigger as part of multi-yr project
  - 1 pointed observation proposed & not approved
- Limited number of multi-year awards
  - 3 of 9 selected, most were good quality
- Very little budget cutting
- Technical evaluations
  - NRAO & NOAO written evals very useful
  - Phone support adequate

Cycle-2 Program

- LAT technical evaluations
  - FSSC→ Project
  - Some were "politico-technical" evaluations
    - gray areas between team programmatics and science
  - 1 proposal basically disallowed, 1 partially
  - Others discussed & deemed appropriate
- NRA language is generally good
  - case-by-case consideration inevitable

Multi-Year Progress Reports

- "Progress Reports" were solicited in tandem w/Cycle-2 proposals
- Mostly a rubber stamping exercise
  - One case where a "deliverable" was not being made on schedule→ useful feedback
- Procedure needs some thought; reviews are already intense activity, so added reading, discussion & caveats burdensome

Cycle-3 NRA

- Streamlines proposal types
  - Fewer categories, but no loss as far as what can be proposed
    - e.g. don't need separate LAT data analysis, GBM data analysis and data analysis methods categories
- Separate caps for US Co-I budgets
  - Consistent policy with other missions
- Guideline for large project awards reduced 8→3
- More detail in page limit, formatting guidelines
- Schedule still driven by agency procurement cycle