

From: [Mitch Boretz](#)
To: [Plimpton, Suzanne H.](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Comments on draft PAPPG
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2019 4:50:32 PM

Hello, Ms. Plimpton. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the latest draft PAPPG. The instructions were not clear on how to submit comments, so I assume e-mail to you is appropriate.

I should point out that I am not speaking on behalf of the University of California in making these comments. Thank you.

We would appreciate a summary of significant changes, as in the past. I presume that the final version will include this.

Section I.D.2, Preliminary Proposals, indicates that one purpose of a preliminary proposal is to reduce the amount of effort involved at this early stage of the process. To fulfill that objective, NSF should enable the PI to submit a preliminary proposal rather than requiring submission through the AOR, which entails quite a bit more effort.

Section II.B.1, Proposal Pagination Instructions, notes that Fastlane does not automatically number pages. You might also want to mention that Research.gov does. I haven't done a Research.gov proposal yet, but I understand that the system won't accept a document that has headers or footers. (This, of course, makes the two systems absolutely incompatible; a proposer must decide from the first day which system to use, and changing midstream is impossible and discourages the migration to Research.gov.)

Section II.C.2.h, Current and Pending Support, tells us in the margin what you won't accept, but it doesn't yet tell us what you will accept.

The instructions on collaborative proposals (II.3.a and II.3.b) should be corrected and harmonized with the development of Research.gov. Right now, PAPPG calls for collaborative proposals submitted by multiple organizations to have the prefix "Collaborative Research:" in the title. This instruction does not apply to a collaborative proposal submitted by a single organization. However, as we learned at the NSF regional meeting in Los Angeles last month, Research.gov's new module for collaborative proposals submitted by a single organization will have the prefix built into the title. Therefore, any collaborative proposal submitted through Research.gov in the foreseeable future will automatically not conform to the PAPPG instructions.

The entire document should be more careful with the word "should." If you mean "must," then say "must."

* * * * *

Mitch Boretz
Bourns College of Engineering, UC Riverside
mitch@engr.ucr.edu

951-827-7069