Answers for Discussion Issues at NY meeting

- Disclaimer info, 20 handouts, reminder e-mail every 2-3 months (how should we handle this?)
  - This is fine, Mark DeMaria suggested also giving this reminder to NOAA employees, and he will put this on the website. (Action item: send copy of Disclaimer to Mark.)

- Performance measures used during the 5-year formal review (Marilyn/Al/CICS-Nov.), refer to Ted’s e-mail about having the review earlier rather than later. Rick Spinrad and Marilyn mentioned that there are documents that refer to these measures.
  - These documents are in the CI handbook.

- Are there any surprises in the new handbook to recompete for C.I.?
  - No, will be available for public view and comment in November.

- New annual report format (refer to Ted’s e-mail and OAR annual report format), can get an example? How much information should be provided for each subproject (could be up to 40)? Send electronic copy to all of the administrators?
  - Mary McInnis-Efaw from CIRA will be sending her last report, which was in the OAR format. I asked if she also might send the process she uses and the template sent to PI’s, along with the final report.

- Separate directors/administrator’s meeting next Spring/Summer (ask Mark)? Our formal review will depend on the timing for this meeting. Offer to hold here next year.
  - This is still under discussion. The meeting has not been formally planned yet for next March. I suggested that we might try to combine the timing for these meetings, so as to only meet once, but Mark thought since the scope of the meetings was so different, it was better to hold them separately. We tentatively are planning to hold the Director/Administrator’s meeting here next year. We need to set a date sometime between June 15 and late July of 2006. (with 2 full days at least for Admin part)

- Who makes decisions regarding CIOSS? CoRP (Ingrid Guch)? Or Eric Bayler?
  - The final answer was that all questions regarding CIOSS should go through Ingrid, not Eric.

- What needs to be done to assign us a new RFP number, so we can submit our proposals for FY2006? (Kathy) Can this be done automatically for next year?
  - Kathy will do this Oct. 31, to be in effect by November 1, 2005. This was delayed because of the adoption of grants online. Kathy said this should be done earlier next year, as in September 2006.

- When are C.I.’s to be used as contractual and when not? In the past we have stayed away from this type of language in proposals from C.I.’s, but e.g. Davis proposal for Technical Support. Should we avoid this entirely, or specifically state this in future proposals?
- Avoid contractual language in proposals. Do not say –doing something for NOAA, but with NOAA, in support of NOAA’s stated mission goals. Public Law 108-199 allows for contractual work from CI’s, but we want to avoid this language. You want to give the idea that we would be better off collaborating than doing the work separately.

- **Action item:** Marilyn also wants us to send examples to her and Mike Nelson of things that might be considered contractual language.

**Other items of discussion:**

- Periodic Reports now go to Ingrid Guch, but Mark DeMaria would still like to receive them as well.

- projects submitted separately through grants.gov. If projects are bundled together, there can be problems with one that hold up all of the other projects.

- Not required, but really like the idea of having a (bi-annual) newsletter with major events, publications, interview from students/professors about their interaction with CIOSS.

- All research projects need to be aligned with NOAA mission goals. This will be required next year on proposals.

- Collaboration between CI’s is encouraged. Ex.: CIMSS Symposium in July, sent post-docs.

- **Action item:** make a FY06 grant plan, give to Kathy by November 18 (NESDIS funding for CIOSS). Need to include: title of proposal, estimate of amount, where the funding is coming from (program, line office), and PI for each.

- From Ingrid: on the budget justification, there are a couple of things that need to be clarified so as not to slow down the approval process. 1) basis for travel costs, ex.: based on costs for past 5 years. 2) lease vs. purchase, how figured out costs, why chose to lease.

- Talked about new policies for NOAA CI’s (PPT will be posted on website, would be best to just print out the pages).

CI handbook: 11/21/05-1/20/06 to review and make comments, approval set date 2/15/06.

Recompetition date for CIOSS: 6/30/2013

Performance Measures: mutually agreed upon by NOAA and CI

CICS will be evaluated under old rules, and CIOSS under mostly new rules. Includes a couple of extra steps (advisory board). Start process 2006, takes about 18 months.
- **Action item:** provide abstract/synopsis/press release with yearly proposal (7th grade language). This will help to speed up the approval process (not mandatory).

**Turn in next year’s omnibus proposal now! Nov/Dec**

- Grants.gov: cannot be provided with where the proposal is in the approval process. After the proposal is received by grants.gov, it goes into the internal NOAA processing, and grants.gov will not go past “assigned tracking number” stage. The only way to find out where the proposal is in the approval process is to check with Kathy (or replacement) as to where it currently is. Award can take up to 180 days.

Improvements: grants online just got disseminated through NOAA this past year, proposals should go through the system before May/June next year. They should take more like 3 months, than 6 months. Steve Drescher said a memo would go out this week, clarifying to GMD how to deal with messages in their grants online inbox, and how to prioritize.

- Kathy has been involved extensively with “Business Process Re-engineering” (BPR). This means looking for ways to eliminate unnecessary steps in the grants process, and also standardizing the process, making sure the answers to questions posed to grants specialists are fairly similar.

- Question: why is NOAA encouraging cost share? Most people seem to be against this. Coming down from above.

**Action item:** Make sure to submit negative comments about this when you see it in the CI Handbook.

**NOAA Action items (list will be posted on website):**

- Improved communications, send things to Ingrid!
- Grants/proposals: let Kathy know what is coming, grants plans to Kathy by 11/18/05.
- BPR
- Exchange of students among CI’s (webex). Short stays during summer.
- Diversity subject under Technical Questions, needs to be further defined.
- FY06 number by 11/01/05.
- Write synopsis/press release, “simple abstract”, include with proposal – needs to be revisited. (not mandatory)
- Send Mike Nelson/Marilyn Moll examples of using contractual language. Show how the proposal fits into overall CIOSS research goals.
- Mary McInnis-Efaw from CIRA: send example of annual report and proposal terminology flags.
- Amy: send Mark DeMaria the electronic version of the Acknowledgements and Disclaimers.
- Look for good date for meeting next year, between June 15 and late July.