

EPSCoR Louisiana/Mississippi Track-2

Answers given in response to questions asked pertaining to the Request for Proposals
as of **August 7, 2013**.

The last day to answer questions is **September 20, 2013**.

Proposals Due: October 2, 2013

Question:

I have attached a short proposal that may fit the Track-2 program. Please let me know if the material is suitable for the proposal.

Answer:

We cannot make determinations as to the suitability of proposed topics; the proposals that are eventually submitted in response to the LA-MS Track-2 Request for Proposals will be reviewed by an external panel of experts and it is this panel that will recommend the most meritorious proposal for submission to NSF, based on the review criteria contained in the NSF Track-2 Program Solicitation NSF 13-509.

Question:

How will proposals be evaluated? Will LA and MS do a common evaluation?

Answer:

Yes. All the proposals that are received will be reviewed using a single, common evaluation process.

Question:

We understand that the typical annual budget is \$1.5 to \$2 million per consortium for three years. If there will be a 50/50 split of the research effort between LA and MS research groups, will this be reflected in a \$0.75 million to \$1 million annual allocation for LA research groups?

Answer:

This is correct.

Question:

What is the role of MS EPSCoR in the LA EPSCoR selection process, and vice versa? Is there any collaboration between LA EPSCoR evaluation process and the one at MS EPSCoR? Can we have some more information regarding the review process for selecting the successful proposal to be submitted to NSF?

Answer:

As noted above, There will be a single evaluation process for Track-2 proposals, using out-of-state reviewers. The reviewers will evaluate the proposals using the review criteria outlined in the NSF solicitation.

Question:

Are there any limitations regarding the participation of a PI in more than one proposal submitted to the Track-2 competition?

Answer:

No.

Question:

Is there any relationship between this NSF RII Track 2 proposal and the current Louisiana NSF RII Track 1 (LASIGMA) project?

Answer:

No.

Question:

It sounds like a detailed categorical budget is not required at this stage. Would it be satisfactory if we provide a table similar to below to show the total funding allocated to each institution? Or should it be further broken down by total direct costs, indirect costs and total costs for each institution?

Answer:

A particular format for the budget has not been specified at this stage of the review process. Proposers should use their best judgment in providing budget information in sufficient detail for evaluation by the reviewers.

Question:

In the NSF RFP for the EPSCoR Track 2 proposal, a 2 page section detailing the results from prior NSF support is required. Since this proposal will be submitted with the EPSCoR officers of each jurisdiction serving as PIs, what level of information on NSF support from the team members assembling the proposal for the October 2nd deadline needs to be included since a more detailed accounting of jurisdiction level NSF supported programs will be inserted in the final proposal transmitted to the NSF? Are ongoing/pending results pages for the team members sufficient at this stage or should we include a more detailed accounting of previous support within the proposal narrative?

Answer:

The final proposal, as you note, will require a discussion of prior NSF support at the State level; however, since this is the pre-proposal stage, the reviewers will particularly need to know the proposer's results from prior NSF support.

Question:

Within the Evaluation and Assessment plans section required by NSF, we are presently assembling information from our team on the relevant goals, metrics, and milestones we use to assess successful completion of the proposed work. As indicated by the state RFP an external assessor will be contracted to perform an unbiased assessment of the team's progress. In the proposal due October 2nd, will it be sufficient to indicate that an external assessor will be contracted to assess the milestones we lay out or will more information be required at this stage?

Answer:

At this stage, it is not necessary to provide a detailed evaluation and assessment plan as long as comprehensive goals, metrics, and milestones are provided to allow the reviewers to evaluate the merit of the proposal.

Question:

What type of participation/commitment from manufacturers is required or would increase a proposal's chances, e.g., cost-share from manufacturers, letters of support, etc.?

Answer:

Letters of commitment are allowable and should illustrate meaningful collaboration between the manufacturer and the proposers; however, please keep in mind that NSF has prohibited the inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing.

Question:

Would including start-ups or other technology commercialization vehicles as partners be valuable, *i.e.*, prospective companies that will commercialize any results of the research to impact economic development?

Answer:

Generally, any initiative that would help with sustainability of the project, workforce development, etc., would strengthen the proposal; however, we cannot specify particular strategies.