



2025 RIG Revision

Mid-scale RI – Section 2.9

Roland Roberts, Deputy CORF
Matt Hawkins, Head, RIO

2024 Research Infrastructure Workshop





Outline for this Session

Refresher on Mid-scale RI definition & programs

Main objectives of Section 2.9

Feedback from the session attendees



American Innovation & Competitive Act (AICA) 2017

Section 109: “...develop a strategy to close the gap” between MRI program and Major Facilities

No statutory oversight requirements

Centralized Mid-scale RI Track 1 and Track 2 Programs

NSF has been funding Mid-scale RI for decades



Mid-scale RI Funding Programs



U.S. National
Science
Foundation

[Find Funding & Apply](#) ▾

[Manage Your Award](#) ▾

[Focus Areas](#) ▾

[News & Events](#) ▾

[About](#) ▾

[Home](#) / [Funding at NSF](#) / [Funding Search](#)

Funding Search

You can find active funding opportunities on this page. Or, [access archived funding opportunities](#).

773 results for "Mid-scale Research Infrastructure"

Development
Design
Implementation



Congressional Definition of Mid-scale RI

Agnostic of funding program and funding account

From MRI (\$4M)...

Implementation
Cost

...to Major Facility (\$100M)





Main Objectives of Section 2.9

Emphasis on scaling (selecting) and tailoring (adjusting)

Expectations for each life-cycle stage

How (and why) they differ from Major Facilities



Scaling and Tailoring the PM Approach

No more than necessary to manage the project or science support program

Generally speaking, “Less is More”

If it works for the Project Team, it should work for NSF oversight

Subject to NSF review and negotiation



Mid-scale RI vs. Major Facilities

Table 2.9.1 – Summary of Oversight Requirements for Major Facility versus Mid-Scale RI



NSF Oversight Requirements for Major Facility versus Mid-scale		
	Major Facilities	Mid-scale RI
Budget Contingency	YES For Construction Stage, Monte Carlo (MC) simulation methods to demonstrate 70-90% confidence.	NO (Highly Recommended) Simplified algorithmic method to full Monte Carlo (MC) simulation, if proposed.
Schedule Contingency	YES	NO
Scope Contingency	YES At least 10% of baseline cost	NO (Recommended based on project complexity and risk profile)



Questions for Session Participants

What in this new section is not clear?

What key elements of this guidance are missing?

What are your concerns with this new guidance?



Discussion