



# 2019 LARGE FACILITIES WORKSHOP

APRIL 2-4 | TEXAS ADVANCED COMPUTING CENTER

## Information Section

<b>Topic:</b>	Update on the LFM (retitled Major Facilities Guide)
<b>Speaker(s) Name, Title:</b>	Rebecca Yasky & Panel
<b>Session Description:</b>	
<b>Session Time Slot:</b>	1:05-2:05pm, Tuesday April 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2019
<b>Purpose and Desired Outcome:</b>	Highlight updates & Q&A

## Notetaking Section

<b>Scribe Name</b>	
--------------------	--

**Disclaimer:** *These are raw notes that were captured by the assigned scribe during this session at the 2019 Large Facilities Workshop. This is one individual's interpretation of what took place during the session, and its content does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the National Science Foundation.*

### Notes and Key Points:

- See next page.
- 

### Best Practices:

- 
- 

### Actionable Recommendations (Action Owner Name & Organization):

- 
- 

### Decisions:

- 
-

## Session Summary

RCRV: (timing on another round of comments?)

Rebecca: OMB looks at how we responded to the comments. Once OMB approves, it'll be published.

OIG (Elisabeth G) – How often do you revise the MFG. What is the plan going forward and what is planned for the next revision.

A – (Matt) Looking like a 2-year cadence. Interim updates as needed. Too big of a lift to do annually. Internal plan once 2019 is released, plan to do an interim update, GAO scheduling section out in early 2020 with public comment on just that section. Also, recipient key personnel from GAO.

Q: Would it be possible to get a short exec summary of spiral development?

Matt: Best example is what we heard from TACC this morning, the FRONTERA proposal. Smaller project comes in to reduce risk, prototype for larger scale project, that is what the guide is trying to describe. Spiral development is already done within projects at smaller scale, this is at more of a strategic level. Examples from MSRI1 & MSRI2 proposals spiral for larger projects.

Q: Section 5 on MSRI has good detail, but suggests a lot of tailoring. Can you comment on design/early stage. EVM,

A: (Joy) On mid-scale, it depends on where you're coming in. Starting in design, you may want to go through to some extent. If you're fairly far along, you may go straight into later stages. NSF may support a period of design.

(Bill) Look back at the solicitation for the requirements and expectations. Section 5 lays out that there are projects that will fall within this realm.

(Matt) We recognize that in the \$6-70M range, there is a wide range of projects; design-level to ready for implementation. We rely on recipient to propose to NSF what they feel is most important. Some projects would benefit from the use of EVM, and some that wouldn't; deliverables-based sort of project, WBS, IMS. Ex, \$20M component of a \$40M project, we may ask/recommend through internal review process. Up to proposing organization and NSF review process. There is a lot of flexibility written into Section 5. Look at it using your expertise, and what you and the project would benefit from.

(Rebecca) It is the concept of Earned Value. What concepts would be advantageous to the project.

Measuring yourself against a plan. What aspects of the project would be useful, to what level of detail. What needs to be in the project execution plan. If there is not value added, we're not expected to do it.

(Jeff) PEP outline looks like a large ominous doc, but it is up to the expertise of the proposer to decide what is applicable in their scenario. Speak to why its NA would be helpful rather than leaving something blank.

(Matt) EVM can be kept simple, we often see over-implementation.

Q: If you add these things, you're adding cost to your proposal and you don't know where the playing field is. In the solicitation, is there an expectation of the timeline of the project, single-year, multi-year, good project tools can give you those answers. Follow up: How is your annual budget set.

Jeff: As the proposer, you submit your funding profile and time of award you are proposing.

Joy:

Bill: Mid-scale is a category. This year is the first time we've done this formally. This is an NSF-wide activity. Two solicitations were written and released, and closed now. The intention was that this would happen on a regular cadence. Very hard to say specifically say what we should expect from your based on the wide range of values \$6M-\$70M

Matt: \$10M over 5 years might be different than a one year \$25M project. We don't know that the appropriation is going to be. The Big Ideas Summary (Bill) has the every 2-year cadence.

Q: OIG (Elisabeth) – When we send the budget request to the Hill, will mid-scale be broken out?

A: Matt – That is pre-decisional discussion with NSF this week.

Q: Is mid-scale directorate-by-directorate funding?

A: Joy – This is an NSF-wide decision.

Matt – Mid-scale is a number at the budget level. See the link from this morning.

Q: MSRI1 comes out of R&RA? Would it hit board threshold based on any office being small enough.

A: Matt – Whether or not it goes to the board: All MREFC goes to the board. R&RA as a % of directorate current plan. For a mid-scale that crosses those thresholds funded from R&RA has to go to the board.

Ann Doyle – It is still being discussed at senior levels of NSF, especially MSRI1, and talks about how to deal with that within NSF.

Matt – MSRI1 & 2 are centralized, but there is also funding directly from Program. Mid-scale is a \$ amount definition.

Joy – If an award has to go to the NSB, that lengthens the award cycle, but what you in the room have to worry about is passing the first level. Need to focus on reading the solicitation and respond to what's required in the solicitation. Did I address everything in the solicitation, do I have things in there that I wasn't asked for that may kick it back. Make it through merit review process first.

Q: Rebecca – Cybersecurity; guidance or mandate.

Bill – We fund TrustedCI who work with many of the facilities, looking at cybersecurity. Also, our hope is that there is lateral sharing of information across the facilities, at a summit to discuss, and participation in that.

Guidance vs requirements is an overarching discussion. NSF as a rule doesn't tell you how to do your job. We want you to be compliant with certain things. Look at your Cybersecurity and check for yourself about the compliance.

Q: Foreign visitors at government funded facilities?

A: Bill – not aware of specific NSF policy.

Elisabeth – It is something their investigations unit has been looking into. OIG has been talking to NSF about the balance, individuals funded by other countries.

Guest – Sometimes there are riders & rules based on other agency funding, NASA, etc.

Guest – Link from COGR on the topic.

Q: Recent GAO recommendation, NSF setting guidelines for how Proj Management should be carried out at recipient large facility.

A: Matt – GAO report. Recipient core competency session later in the workshop. We have a plan, also PMIAA (only applies to feds), recommendations from NAPA report. Progress behind the scenes, but bringing that forward now. Jeff's session will be key to capturing your input and communicating.

Q: OIG (Elisabeth) – Cost control, accuracy, no-cost-overflow policy, same cost controls for mid-scale that use MREFC funding?

A: (Jeff) Yes, cost controls are the same for any federal grant. Really has to be scaled based on type of project. Oversight needs to be appropriate. For example one project may be 3 lines of level-of-effort, while other mid-scale projects may be schedule based with hundreds of elements, predecessors, & successors.

Q: Rebecca – Final construction review.

A: Not re-adjudicating the science. Documenting and reviewing was the project delivered into construction. There is a window on the timing to affect the close-out outcome or to document once done.

Q: Construction close out. I'm interested in operations close out review. A lot hinges on Program Officer.  
Joy –