

From: [Hawkins, Matthew J.](#)
To: [Yasky, Rebecca Kay](#)
Cc: [Breen, Patrick K.](#); [McCollum, Raymond L.](#)
Subject: RE: Sikuliaq recompile process
Date: Thursday, April 29, 2021 9:24:38 AM

Thanks! Per Patrick's response, please work with Ray on the revision to align it with FAR. We want to start aligning our policies. Let me know if we need to include a few words in the final version of the SOG to tie it together better.

Matt

From: Yasky, Rebecca Kay <ryasky@nsf.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 9:21 AM
To: Hawkins, Matthew J. <mjhawkin@nsf.gov>
Cc: Breen, Patrick K. <pkbreen@nsf.gov>
Subject: RE: Sikuliaq recompile process

Good Morning Matt – I will take the first pass at updating the MFG Section 3.5.2 to align with the SOG. I'll use track changes and provide for your review.
Rebecca

From: Hawkins, Matthew J. <mjhawkin@nsf.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 6:58 AM
To: Yasky, Rebecca Kay <ryasky@nsf.gov>
Cc: Breen, Patrick K. <pkbreen@nsf.gov>
Subject: FW: Sikuliaq recompile process

Good morning, Rebecca...please see the exchange below in way of background. I think we'll need some minor administrative updates to Section 3.5.2 of the MFG to better align with the new SOG. I'd like to get those in now before public release of the final version in September. You have the SOG. Would you like to take a first pass at it, or shall I?

For example, paragraph two could begin with *"In accordance with internal NSF standard operating guidance..."* and talk about an "internal" review as opposed to a panel review. Paragraph one might have to be moved down and the text modified to align with the SOG wrt an annual operations review, rather than a special review.

Patrick...I note this section of the MFG has additional details for FFRDCs that we don't have in the SOG. Is this a good place for Rebecca to work with Ray to make sure the MFG and SOG are consistent with FAR? It may actually help us with our activities in the Arecibo memo?

Matt

From: Hawkins, Matthew J.

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 9:27 PM

To: Dufour, Rose <rdufour@nsf.gov>

Cc: Kaczmarek, Ryszard <rkaczmar@nsf.gov>; Houtman, Bauke H. <bhoutman@nsf.gov>; Avallone, Linnea <lavallon@nsf.gov>

Subject: Re: Sikuliaq recompetite process

Hi, Rose...your timing on this question is ideal! New standard operating guidance on the process for recommending renewal, competition or divestment just went to the Facilities Governance Board for review and approval this week. Both Rich and Linnea have a draft copy and it will be made more broadly available once approved and finalized. It aligns with the NSB's latest guidance, which does not automatically require a competition anymore. The agency's position has evolved since the SIKULIAQ transitioned to operations.

I'd suggest you and Bob meet with Linnea and Rich to review the process. I think you will be pleased with the way it has been laid out.

We'll likely need to revisit Section 3.5.2 of the MFG based on this new internal guidance. Thanks for bringing that up too.

Matt

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 28, 2021, at 7:36 PM, Dufour, Rose <rdufour@nsf.gov> wrote:

Hi Rich,

As I mentioned last month, we need to receive guidance/input on the “recompetite” process for R/V *Sikuliaq*. During my annual negotiations with UAF I did let them know that they should expect a recompetite review/process late this year or early 2022 per the terms and conditions of their NSF CA. Under the LFO manual **3.5.2 Procedures for Renewal or Recompetition of an Operating Large Facility**, there is a section dealing with this, but I want to make sure that I’m not missing some key components to the process. Do I convene a panel? Or is just a matter of answering the following questions:

The review should analyze the costs and benefits of the facility, taking into consideration the following issues:

- *How much does the community need the facility, and is the community strong and actively engaged in utilizing it?*
- *Is the facility meeting the research, educational outreach and broader societal Impact goals and objectives originally proposed?*

- *Has the facility reached its annual performance goals, and if not, what are the reasons for not meeting any goals?*
- *Will meeting the goals and objectives place the United States in a leading position within the research areas served by the facility?*
- *Is the facility a high priority of the field, as established by long-range planning?*
- *Is the facility operating in an efficient and cost-effective manner, or are there alternative, more efficient and cost-effective ways to meet the need?*
- *What research opportunities and education opportunities elsewhere are being lost by continued support of this facility?*

If the reviews show that the facility remains a high priority and has been successful in meeting its goals and objectives, the Originating Organization considers whether renewal of the operating agreement with the Recipient institution, or recompetition, is in the best interests of NSF and the affected community. In deciding whether to renew or recompile, the PO will take into consideration that the NSB has expressed its preference for recompeting all awards periodically.¹ Awards may be renewed without recompetition or with only limited competition if there is sufficient justification (e.g., facilities or facility sites with special features that preclude relocation or recompetition, or partnership-related complexities that prevent recompetition).

I should state up front, I have no desire to recompile *Sikuliaq*. UAF has done an excellent job in their stewardship of the vessel, the outreach with the indigenous communities, and investments in their shore support, not to mention the intense interest the Alaska congressional delegations has shown in *Sikuliaq*'s activities.

It would be nearly impossible to duplicate the current operating model without significant cost to NSF and the tax payers.

Thanks,
Rose

Rose Dufour
Program Director, Ship Operations
GEO/OCE/IPS
National Science Foundation
Room 8129 W
2415 Eisenhower Avenue,
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
<image001.jpg>

Direct phone: (703) 292-8811
Cell phone: (703) 220-8967

NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain non-public and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. Please do not forward or blind-copy in your reply back, unless you have received written permission to expand the intended audience. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.