

From: [Joseph Resing](#)
To: [Plimpton, Suzanne H.](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Comment on new proposal guide
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2022 8:46:05 PM

This email originated from outside of the National Science Foundation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I wish to comment on the proposed PAPPG for 2022 and beyond.
Here are my comments:

CURRENT AND PENDING

With regards to the use of SciENCv. The use of this separate website to produce Biographical sketches and current and Pending reports is an extra burden for scientists proposing to NSF.

The required use of SciENCv is a solution looking for a problem. The previous methods worked just fine and most people knew how to use them while also following the rules for their submission. SciENCv is difficult to navigate because each item is entered separately without the ability to readily review the document holistically.

In the PDF forms for C&P, you can enter the information and scroll down to see other information on the form. That PDF is elegant, simple and does not create an additional work burden on the individual submitting the proposal.

BIO SKETCHES

Originally Bio sketches could be created in a word processing program residing locally on a personal computer or online. In that case, you could see the whole document as you filled it in and thus could see each product in the context of others. Bio sketches change depending on proposals. By going to three pages in the last PAPPG, the burden to correctly format was lifted, but was required due to the difficulty and inefficiency associated with SciENCv. IN SciENCv you must add and subtract by clicking boxes and then look at the output. In reality, to do this efficiently you basically have to go to the old format in a word processor and then go through the painful forces in SciENCv and cross compare the two documents. Ultimately this is an additional burden on the individual filling in the form.

My recollection is that neither form is directly added to your proposal so you must download the product and then upload it into the funding website (Fastlane, research.gov, ect..). So SciENCv creates extra steps, is harder to use, requires going to a secondary web site, and does not allow easy review of the product being produced. These are all extra burdens.

PLAN FOR SAE AND INCLUSIVE FIELD/AIRCRAFT RESEARCH (PSU-FVAR)

The addition of the "Plan for safe and inclusive field/Aircraft Research (PSI-FVAR)" to the proposal is a very large burden on the project lead of the proposal. Unless reviewers and panels address this in their reviews, it would seem that this section should be filled out upon successful review of the proposal but prior to funding. The success for original NSF proposals is fairly poor (>25%) and likely much poorer for those proposing ship time. Individuals and teams proposing research will

need to go to great lengths to fill in this form by addressing many, many requirements (Identifying and costing trainings and identifying several different plans; the list is extensive.) Why place this large burden on so many additional individuals when it section is not important until the project is to be recommended for funding? One thing not addressed in the PAPPG is whether additional funding will be granted to address this burden once funded. I understand the purpose of this section, but in the case of ships, UNOLS and the universities running the ships address many of these issues prior to the researchers stepping on board the ships and again just prior to the start of the cruise. Many of the things listed fall under the purview of the ship. To fill in this form, am I required to contact each acceptable ship and ask about their procedures and policies prior to getting funded? It just seems that the cart is way ahead of the horse on this section as it applies to NSF funded assets like UNOLS ships. I think that you need to consider the added burden to writing a proposal and whether it actually will be effective in accomplishing its goals. There is a better way to do this.

Thanks, and best regards,

Joe Resing

--

Dr. Joseph Resing
Deputy Director Cooperative Institute
for Climate, Ocean, and Ecosystem Studies
University of Washington and NOAA-PMEL
7600 Sand Point Way NE
NOAA/PMEL Building #3
Seattle, WA 98115

Phone: 206-526-6184 - not currently forwarded
Contact me for my cell #