******The 2018 Collaborative Science Catalyst request for proposals has been amended. Please see the addendum on page 22 of the RFP for a summary of clarifications and how they affect proposal requirements.******

National Estuarine Research Reserve System Science Collaborative
2018 Collaborative Science Catalyst RFP
Q&A Record

Last updated: February 19, 2018

Letters of Intent (LOI)

Q: Will feedback be provided after LOI submission?
A: There will be no feedback provided after LOI submission. LOIs will be used to inform reviewer recruitment, not the review process. Applicants should not expect a response or comments to the LOI other than confirmation of receipt.

Q: Does the letter of intent require letters of support from project collaborators?
A: No.

Q: Can reserves be added to a proposal if they were not included in the LOI?
A: Yes. The LOI should include the name(s) of participating reserves that are expected to be directly engaged in the project. Other reserves may be added to the proposal if they decide to participate in the proposed work in between submitting the LOI and the proposal.

Eligibility

Q: Can reserves of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System apply for catalyst grants?
A: Yes.

Q: Can Science Collaborative project funds be used to support federal employees and/or their travel?
A: NERRS Science Collaborative funds may **not** be used to support salary or travel for federal employees; however, federal employees may participate as unfunded project team members.

Q: Are for-profit entities eligible recipients for Science Collaborative funding?
A: Yes, private and for-profit firms are eligible recipients for Science Collaborative funding, so long as they are working in partnership with one or more reserves and meet the requirements described in the RFP.

Q: Is funding restricted to work performed on reserves?
A: NERRS Science Collaborative projects are not required to be located within the physical boundaries of a National Estuarine Research Reserve, or necessarily within a reserve's watershed. However, projects must be directly related to at least one reserve, address at least one or more reserve management need, and must have the full support of the relevant reserve manager(s), as demonstrated in the reserve manager proposal assessment(s).

Collaboration and End User Engagement

Q: Are the National Estuarine Research Reserves themselves appropriate end users?
A: Yes, reserves can be end users if they will be using the results of the project. End user is defined as a person or group in a position to apply the information or tools being produced, evaluated, or transferred through a Science Collaborative project in a way that is of direct consequence to the ecological, social, or economic integrity of a reserve(s) and/or

surrounding watershed(s). Examples of end users include, but are not limited to, reserve staff, and public, private, or non-governmental decision/policy makers, including landowners, resource managers, land use planners, and educators at all levels.

Q: Can researchers and scientists be end users?
A: Yes; researchers and scientists may be end users if the research will ultimately address a reserve management need. In this case, the proposal must make clear why the research is needed to address an identified reserve management need.

Q: Can NOAA be an end user?
A: Yes, NOAA may be an end user if they will use the results to benefit their work.

Q: Are end users required to be team members?
A: No; while you may choose to include an end user on your project team, you are not required to do so.

Q: Do the primary end users need to be regional or nationally scaled or both?
A: The end users should be relevant to the project you propose. If you are proposing a SWMP synthesis, keep in mind the requirement for these syntheses to have a regional and/or national application and therefore the need to connect the work to end users at this scale.

Q: Can you provide more information on the collaborative lead? Is this someone separate from the project lead?
A: The collaborative lead is someone who is responsible for the full engagement of end users by helping to develop and manage a process that ensures iteration with them, including mechanisms for being adaptive and responsive to their input. This person should have the appropriate experience and skills to design and implement a collaborative process that provides the team with the end user input necessary to produce outputs that are responsive to their needs. This collaborative lead may but does not have to be the project lead.

Q: Who can serve as the collaborative lead?
A: Project teams should include a collaborative lead who has the appropriate skills and experience to lead the collaborative process. The proposal should clearly demonstrate how the collaborative lead has the appropriate skills to successfully facilitate the collaborative aspects of the project. This person may also play a technical or other role on the team, if appropriate.

Q: We have a long list of end users. Do you have suggestions for how we might go about identifying a smaller group of primary end users?
A: For one-year projects, this step is especially important to be able to focus your time and energy in order to have an impact. You want to be able to identify the best set of end users most directly and tightly connected to the work. There are a few resources on the Science Collaborative funding page that should help in identifying primary end users. See the

"Characterizing end users" and "Reflections on engaging end users" resources at the bottom of this page.

Q: If our reserve is involved as a collaborator and lead reserve, are we also an end-user?
A: That really depends on whether the reserve is in a position to use project results to enhance their work in some way. Reserves can play a variety of roles in projects. Refer to the end user definition and end user engagement section of the RFP, starting on page seven, for more guidance.

Q: Are letters of support required from all end-users?
A: All proposals must include at least one letter of support from an end user. End users should describe how they have been engaged with the development of the proposal and how they anticipate using project outputs. Reviewers will be looking for this information to confirm end user engagement.

Reserve Engagement

Q: If I am working with a reserve research coordinator to develop a proposal, is this sufficient for the reserve engagement requirement, or should I also reach out to the reserve manager directly?
A: As the applicant, it is your job to ensure that the relevant manager(s) are fully aware of and sufficiently engaged in your proposal as it is developed in order to provide a positive assessment. In this case, it would be good to double check that the research coordinator has connected with the manager about the proposed work to receive any input he/she may have and to ensure everyone is on the same page.

Q: Is it acceptable to ask reserve managers for the use of reserve equipment and/or personnel time?
A: You should feel free to reach out to reserve managers with these types of questions; however, it is up to them to decide how to respond. You should be aware that capacity and ability to accommodate these kinds of requests will vary from reserve to reserve.

Q: Will the reserves be given the opportunity to update their management needs annually?
A: Yes, reserves are asked annually, prior to the release of Science Collaborative request for proposals, to review and update, if necessary, their reserve management needs.

Q: The list of reserve management needs shows a lot of overlap in the general issues (e.g. climate, water quality), but if you read the specifics for each reserve, they are rather divergent. Can you recommend strategies for determining a project that would be applicable to multiple reserves?
A: This is largely the job of the applicant. Start by having a conversation with the reserve with which you have a close relationship and see where that leads you.

Q: If you are submitting a proposal involving the entire NERR System, would this require a manager assessment from every manager?
A: Relevant managers are those whose reserves will be directly engaged in project implementation and, as a result, should be able to answer each of the three manger assessment criteria listed on pages 8-9 of the RFP definitively. If a reserve is not directly engaged in the proposed work, that reserve should not be listed as a partner on the project title page and the manager will not be expected to submit a proposal assessment.

Q: What is expected in terms of reserve engagement for conducting SWMP syntheses with the potential for regional and/or national application?
A: You could approach this in a number of ways. You could engage and work directly with a number of reserves in a particular region or across the country for a national perspective. You could also work on a project with a single reserve as long as you demonstrate how the output can be applied to more than that single reserve. In all cases, you should reach out to and directly engage the reserve(s) that will be participating in project implementation. Other reserves who stand to benefit from the work but are not directly participating can vouch for the importance of the work by submitting letters of support.

Q: Does a reserve listed under section 5 on the title page have to have a named team member to be included here?
A: Listing a reserve on the title page does not require you to include staff from that reserve on the project team. However, you should clearly demonstrate support (via letters of support from end users and manager assessments) and provide detail about how the reserves are contributing to and benefiting from the project in your narrative.

Q: Should applicants solicit and attach manger proposal assessments in appendix E or do those get submitted separately by the reserves?
A: The manager proposal assessments as referenced on pages 8 and 9 of the RFP are submitted by reserves directly to the Science Collaborative. You are also free to attach letters of support from reserves in appendix E. Please keep in mind that you must include at least one letter of support from an end user with the information specified on page 15 of the RFP.

Q: Are there added roles and responsibilities assigned to the "lead reserve"?
A: There are no added roles or responsibilities for the lead reserve.

Review & Selection Process

Q: On page 18 of the RFP it says, "No reserve will serve as the lead reserve on more than one proposal." Does this mean a reserve can only support one proposal submission or does this mean multiple proposals can be submitted with the same lead reserve but, in the selection process, only one of those multiple proposal could be awarded?
A: This selection factor allows the Science Collaborative, in consultation with the NOAA Program Officer, to select out of rank order to ensure that a single reserve is not the lead

reserve for more than one award through this funding opportunity. A reserve may support more than one proposal submission but the selection process allows the program to fund no more than one of the proposals the reserve is leading.

Q: Page 18 of the RFP states that, "No reserve will serve as the lead reserve on more than one proposal." As I understand it, funding will be awarded to no more than one project with the same lead reserve. Is that true for just this Catalyst opportunity or does it extend to other Science Collaborative grants in the future?
A: No more than one award per lead reserve applies to this catalyst competition only. If a lead reserve is funded through this opportunity, it will not affect their ability to receive future awards.

Budget

Q: I am developing a proposal that includes several reserves and a couple of other subcontracts, which has implications for administering and indirect costs. Is there an alternate way for the Science Collaborative to administer funds to multiple reserves on a project like this or is it best to plan this as a single award to one fiscal agent with subcontracts below that?
A: Please plan the budget as a single award to one fiscal agent with subcontracts below that.

Q: What are the requirements for Science Collaborative projects regarding indirect cost rates?
A: The Science Collaborative recognizes federally negotiated indirect cost rates (i.e., there is no cap on indirect costs). Lower indirect cost rates are acceptable, if the proposing organization or institution approves it. If the fiscal agent does not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate, they may apply a rate of 10%. Indirect costs, including fringe, for subcontractors may be folded into the itemized budget line items; we do not need to see these costs broken out. However, subcontractors should adhere to their federally-negotiated IDC rate; if they do not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate, they should apply a rate of 10%.

Q: What budget template should subcontracts use?
A: Subcontracts should use the budget template linked to in the RFP. The budget template should be completed for the full budget *and* for any subcontracts. The full budget should provide the total annual amounts for each subcontract in section F. Specific costs for each subcontract must then be detailed in a separate budget sheet which should follow the same format as the template. Each subcontract should also be accompanied by a budget narrative.

Q: Do fringe and indirect wages need to be broken out separately in the budget or can hourly rates include those costs?
A: Please use the budget template linked to in the RFP located here. Hourly rates, fringe, and IDC should be broken out separately.

Q: Can we use the federal fringe rate when estimating personnel costs on the budget.
A: Yes, we do not limit fringe rates, so you may apply the federal fringe rate.

Q: If we have team members who are not requesting funding but are part of our team do we need to submit a budget for them or should their contributions just be mentioned in the budget narrative?
A: For team members contributing to the project but not requesting funding, you do not need to submit a budget for them. Instead, please be sure to account for their time and contributions to the project in the budget narrative. E.g., Jane Doe will contribute approximately 20 hours to the project to support field work but is not requesting funds. See item "iii" on page 14 of the RFP for more specific guidance on this element.

Q: Is there a cap on the award amount for a one-reserve proposal?
A: No, there is not an award cap for a single reserve proposal, however, we expect the larger awards, closer to $250k, will be for multi-reserve projects.

Data Management

Q: Who should we contact with data management questions?
A: All questions regarding proposal requirements and development, including data management, should be sent to nerrs-info@umich.edu.

Q: In terms of making data available, do project teams need to have web hosting capabilities or is NOAA able to support this?
A: While the NERRS Centralized Data Management Office (CDMO) does not have the resources to support the development and maintenance of individual project websites, the CDMO does have the resources to support projects that need a mechanism by which to make the data and associated metadata available. Depending upon the needs of a project and intended users of the data, the CDMO can support data access via a variety of approaches including web-based data downloads and web services for data pushes and pulls.

Q: What is the definition of "derived data"?
A: The NOAA/NERRS Science Collaborative requirements for data sharing are in effect for new data collected as part of a NSC-funded activity and for derived data created as part of such activity. "Derived data" refers to information derived from existing data resources and/or new data that you have collected. As an example, a project focusing on coastal resiliency may collect data on the environmental, social, infrastructural and policy characteristics of communities in support of developing a coastal resiliency index for each community. The determined resiliency index for each community would be considered derived data.

Q: If we have a dynamic modeling component, should those results be considered new data, even if it is incorporating existing observed data?

A: Model outputs are considered derived data and this would therefore require a Data Sharing Plan.

Q: If we plan to use the CDMO to host our data, do we need to get permission or some sort of agreement to include in the proposal?
A: Not every project will need to utilize CDMO services for data sharing or archival. For those projects that do anticipate needing support from the CDMO, however, the team's designated data management point of contact should contact the CDMO (via nerrs-info@umich.edu) to discuss the project's needs and develop an appropriate strategy. The proposal's Data Sharing Plan should reflect the approach agreed-upon by the CDMO and the data management point of contact. There is no need to include a formal agreement in the proposal.

Q: For projects that are collecting very large data sets, e.g., imagery, can the team submit the metadata to the CDMO or other NOAA repository but store or archive the raw data using a proposing team member's institutional resources?
A: Yes, this is an appropriate strategy; NOAA's repositories may be able to accommodate such large data sets for archival purposes, but timely access of stored data can be an issue. The proposing team should describe this process in their Data Sharing Plan and provide links to any existing websites that will be used to make data accessible.

Q. For projects that propose running models, how should the storage and availability of model outputs be addressed?
A: Archival and access to model outputs can present the same challenges as with imagery described above. Project teams should develop an appropriate strategy for both archival and access of model outputs.

Q: How should projects address long-term accessibility and usability of project data sets, results, models or other tools?
A: Ideally, the project team should engage intended users from the beginning and work together to develop a plan for making data, results and tools accessible and usable for end users during and after the project period. Intended users will have different needs, capabilities and expectations for how they might access and use project outputs. Storing project datasets in established data repositories (e.g., CDMO, NODC) is important, but additional steps may need to be taken to ensure that intended users are able to find and apply project results.

Q: Is there a standard for social science data, similar to the standards for environmental data?
A: No, there is no standard for social science data, as the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process for human subject research varies from institution to institution. Research studies involving human subjects require IRB review. Evaluative studies and activities do not. However, it is not always easy to distinguish between these two types of projects and many projects frequently have elements of both. Human subjects are defined as "living individual(s) about whom an investigator conducting research obtains (1) data through

intervention or interaction with the individual; or (2) identifiable private information." Research involving the secondary analysis of existing data must be also reviewed by the IRB to ensure that the original data was properly and ethically obtained and that the objectives of the secondary analysis are aligned with those for which consent was obtained. All human subject research, as explained above, regardless of whether or not identifying information is collected must be reviewed by the IRB. The research, including the recruitment of research participants, cannot begin until the application has been reviewed and approved. Therefore, the decision about whether review is required should be made in concert with the IRB. Proposing teams should identify and comply with the IRB process that is appropriate for their project team. If you have any questions about whether this applies to your project, please contact us (nerrs-info@umich.edu).

Q: Would documenting end-users' or stakeholders' needs ahead of proposal development (through a series of interviews) be considered "new data collection" that would require IRB approval?
A: Please refer to your home institution to determine whether this kind of data collection requires prior IRB review and approval.

Q: Are letters of support from the Centralized Data Management Office required for projects that propose using System-Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) data?
A: Because SWMP data are readily accessible, there is no need to include a letter of support in proposals that call for the use of SWMP data.

Q: What services are the CDMO able to provide for funded NSC projects? What services will the CDMO NOT provide?
A: The CDMO can host data and associated metadata for funded NSC projects that need such a service. The CDMO can also provide web services for projects that need to provide data pushing or pulling services. Individual projects are responsible for expenses and activities associated with data collection, QA/QC and metadata development, though the CDMO can provide some guidance in these areas if needed. Please note that the CDMO can only provide web-based data archiving and access services; the CDMO will NOT provide for the development and maintenance of full-blown websites for individual projects.

Q: Are there expenses associated with utilizing the CDMO's data-hosting services that should be included in the project budget?
A: There are no costs associated with the CDMO's data-hosting services that need to be included in the project budget.

Q: Are there formatting requirements for data that will be transferred to the CDMO for data-hosting services?
A: The Centralized Data Management Office (CDMO) will not be requiring specific data formats. The CDMO will be available to offer assistance, if requested. What will be expected is that associated metadata provided by projects will clearly state the data formats, QA/QC methods, etc. as outlined in the Data Sharing Plan Requirements and Outline.

Q: Is the data sharing plan similar to those required as part of NOAA or NSF proposals?
A: Yes. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) requires that data collected and/or created under NOAA grants and cooperative agreements must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users, free of charge or at minimal cost, in a timely manner (typically no later than two (2) years after the data are collected or created), except where limited by law, regulation, policy, or security requirements. Therefore, NERRS Science Collaborative project proposals must include a section describing the Data Sharing Plan (DSP). This section should describe how the proposal will conform to Department of Commerce and NOAA/NOS guidelines for data sharing and metadata and should include descriptions of the following components:

- Methods and protocols for data collection.
- Data quality control / quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures.
- Metadata.
- Data access.
- Data archival.

It is expected that methods and protocols for data collection, QA/QC, and metadata development will be described within the DSP. Plans for data access and archival should include how data will be made accessible and how data will be archived. Examples of data management plans are available at the NOAA Environmental Data Management Wiki (https://geo-ide.noaa.gov/wiki/index.php?title=Main_Page) under the Data Management Plan Repository. A valid DSP may include only the statement that no detailed plan is needed, as long as the statement is accompanied by a clear justification (e.g. no new data are being collected).

Q: Is it expected that data will be archived at the NERRS CDMO?
A: Not every project will need or want to utilize CDMO services or support for data sharing or archiving. Ideally, the project should identify a strategy for transferring the project results, including data access and archival, to the end user(s) over the course of the project. However, if the end user(s) do not have the ability or capacity to store, provide access to, or archive the data, the data may be archived at the National Oceanic Data Center (NODC), though access is more difficult in this case. For those projects that do need/want to utilize CDMO services, the proposing team's designated data management point of contact should contact the CDMO (via nerrs-info@umich.edu) to discuss the project's needs and develop an appropriate strategy. The proposal's Data Sharing Plan should reflect the approach agreed-upon by the CDMO and the data management point of contact.

Q: Does meta-data need to be submitted to a clearinghouse, where should it be stored, and will the Science Collaborative store it?
A: The NOAA EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive calls for the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for data documentation. Metadata should reside with the data; i.e. metadata should be accessible from the same location as are the data. In addition,

projects are encouraged to submit project metadata to appropriate clearinghouses / catalogs. Currently there are a number of widely accessible metadata clearinghouses / catalogs (see https://geo-ide.noaa.gov/wiki/index.php?title=Metadata_Catalogs) for examples. For those projects with questions about relevancy / appropriateness of identified metadata clearinghouses/catalogs, the proposing team's designated data management point of contact should contact the CDMO (via nerrs-info@umich.edu) to discuss the project's needs and develop an appropriate strategy.

Q: If we are collecting data with an existing DSP under CDMO, such as SWMP data, as well as new, original data, how should we articulate this in our data sharing plan?
A: It is important to be as detailed as possible on what data are being collected, where it will be stored, and how it can be accessed. In the case above, it is important to detail which data being collected are SWMP data and what are new, original data and how they will be managed. NERRS CDMO wants to know where data management responsibilities lie and where the data resides in case authorized individuals are interested in seeing portions of the data collected.

Q: Our data collection will be adaptive with timing and frequency depending on certain triggers. How should we detail this in our data sharing plan?
A: Data sharing plans should document data collection, storage, and access to the fullest extent possible. In this case, it would be important to specify as many of the triggers as you can identify. If there are uncertainties in the process, these should be articulated as well.

Q: Our data collection coincides with a NERRS Long-Term Ecological Research (LTER) program. Does this affect our data sharing plan at all?
A: If data are collected as part of LTER activities, it is expected that data collection activities are adhering to LTER data management requirements. Please specify if your data are being managed through the LTER program in your DSP.

Q: What are the timeframe requirements for making data publicly available? We would like to make sure we have an opportunity to publish our results before making data publicly available.
A: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) requires that environmental data collected and/or created under NOAA grants and cooperative agreements must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users, free of charge or at minimal cost, in a timely manner (typically no later than two (2) years after the data are collected or created), except where limited by law, regulation, policy or security requirements. Failing to share environmental data in accordance with the submitted DSP may lead to disallowed costs and may impact future funding decisions by NOAA and the University of Michigan.

Q: All of the existing data that we are planning on using is public domain, and is currently in our possession; what information should we include in the "Data Accessibility" section of the DSP?

A: If the existing data you plan to use is already publicly available, you should indicate in the "Data Accessibility" section that the data you plan to use are already in the public domain; be sure to include a description from where those data are available.

Q: Where can we find the ISO 19115 Metadata Standards that are referenced in the DSP guidance?
A: The ISO 19115 Metadata Standards are available on NOAA's website at: https://geo-ide.noaa.gov/wiki/index.php?title=ISO_19115_Core_Elements

Q: Does including collected data in a table or as an appendix of a published manuscript or technical report suffice for meeting the requirements for data sharing?
A: Sharing data is defined as making data visible, accessible, and independently understandable to users in a timely manner at minimal cost to users, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or by security requirements. While including collected data in a table or as an appendix in a published manuscript or technical report is encouraged, that alone does not meet the NOAA requirements for data sharing. It is expected that each project collecting new data will make the actual QA/QC'd data and associated metadata available and archived via a web portal or data repository maintained by the project investigators, project partners, a NOAA-approved data warehouse, or the CDMO.

Q: If our project is collecting new data to augment or integrate into an already existing dataset, do we also need to make available the previously collected data?
A: No; the requirement to archive and share data applies only to data collected with Science Collaborative funding.

Q: Can you provide an example Data Sharing Plan for a project that is related to coastal or estuarine research?
A: Yes – a sample estuarine research Data Sharing Plan is available on the RFP webpage: http://graham.umich.edu/water/nerrs/funding/catalyst

Q: Are there other examples of data sharing plans that have been done well?
A: Yes, NOAA has put together a set of examples of well-constructed data sharing plans. Examples of data management plans are available at the NOAA Environmental Data Management Wiki under the Data Management Plan Repository.

Q: Can you clarify how CDMO data are available for sharing or bringing into the development of a new product? Is there any flexibility to this protocol?
A: There are protocols for the ensuring quality and integrity of data as it is being shared, and there are some limitations on external archiving of data. The CDMO and protocols it adheres to are guided by the NERRS Data Management Committee and, while we are unable to comment on modifications to long-standing protocols, the goal is to be as flexible as possible to ensure the greatest access to NERRS and SWMP data.

Other

Q: For the different roles of team members, it is clear that a Project Lead and Collaborative Lead are required, and they are well-defined in the RFP. However, in the team member roles section, "technical lead" is also listed but lacks a definition and it is unclear if this role is required.
A: You do not need to specify a technical lead for this RFP. If not specified, our assumption is that the project lead can be considered the technical lead. You do have the option to separate these two roles and specify a technical lead as someone other than project lead if that makes sense for your team and project. As reference, the following are the definitions we have used for prior RFPs when all three roles were required.

- The project lead ensures all elements of the project are being implemented.
- The collaborative lead is responsible for the full engagement of end users by helping to develop and manage a process that ensures iteration with them, including mechanisms for being adaptive and responsive to their input.
- The technical lead ensures the quality of the science.

Q: Who should letters of support be addressed to?
A: Letters of support should be addressed to "Members of the Review Panel".

Q: Who should letters of commitment be addressed to?
A: Letters of support may be addressed to "Members of the Review Panel" or the fiscal agent.

Q: The selection process (pages 18-19 of the RFP) includes a criterion that states "No reserve will serve as the lead reserve on more than one proposal."
Does this mean that a reserve may serve as the lead for only <u>one</u> proposal? Will proposals be reviewed independently? Will the Science Collaborative be looking to the reserves to indicate their preference if there are multiple proposals involving their reserves?
A: No, a reserve may serve as the lead for and submit more than one proposal. However, this selection criterion means that a maximum of one proposal will be funded per lead reserve. All proposals will be reviewed independently. While we do not expect reserves to choose one proposal over the other, we encourage managers to provide their perspective about the value of each proposal involving their reserve in their manager assessments.

Q: How do we decide whether to include a reserve on the proposal title page as a participating reserve?
A: As you likely recognize, demonstration of end user interest is important for this program, but you can focus on the reserve(s) most interested and engaged in the proposed work. It is up to you to decide whether to list additional reserves on your cover page and how to demonstrate their interest, e.g., in the proposal narrative or through letter(s) of support as end users.

Please note that if you decide to identify additional reserves as being "directly engaged" in the project and list them on your title page, this triggers the expectation that a reserve manager assessment will be submitted from each of those reserves, as well as from the lead reserve.

Q: It seems like it may be potentially to distinguish between RFP objective 1 and 2 for many projects. If you are proposing to conduct new work, but with some partners with whom you have previously collaborated as well as new ones, building on earlier efforts, which objective does this fall under?
A: This is something the project team will need to determine. Consider where the preponderance of effort lies—is the proposed project mostly building on existing work and taking it to the next level (objective 2) or is it really a new topic or effort (objective 1)?

Q: The proposal evaluation criteria for potential impact indicates that the project outcome/product should 'catalyze science'. Can you elaborate on that, please?
A: In terms of "catalyzing science" we are interested in supporting activities that advance collaborative science by facilitating the development of new collaborative science ideas; amplifying or enhancing existing collaborative research; or synthesizing NERRS System Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) data for a regional or national application.

Q: Should two-page resumes be included for team members not receiving funding?
A: Yes, please include two-page resumes for all team members, even if they are not requesting funding.

Q: Do the two-page team members' resumes need to be in Times New Roman 12-point font?
A: Team members' resumes do not need to be in Times New Roman 12-pt font. However, they should not exceed two pages in length.

Q: How many projects do you anticipate funding?
A: The number of projects funded will be dependent on the outcomes of the review process; we are unable to predict what this number will be at this time. Approximately $900,000 total is available for supporting projects through this funding opportunity.

Q: Who administers the funds granted by the Science Collaborative—the University of Michigan or the program directly?
A: Funds will be administered via a subcontract from the University of Michigan.

Q: Is it preferred to focus on an individual RFP objective or cover multiple objectives?
A: There is not a preference for focusing on one versus multiple RFP objectives with a single project. We encourage you to focus on what is achievable within the one-year project timeline.

Q: The RFP states that work under objective 2 (amplify or enhance existing collaborative research efforts) must be new and distinct from prior or existing collaborative research projects. Can you elaborate?
A: It is important that the proposed work take the existing work to the next level. If you are building on a prior project, you must have completed and delivered everything you set out to achieve in that project. It should be clear that what you propose for a catalyst grant is not the completion of something you set out to do previously but, rather, building on that work and achieving something different and significant for your end users.

Q: Does objective 2 in the RFP (amplify or enhance existing collaborative research efforts) pertain to only Science Collaborative funded collaborative research, or does it pertain to other collaborative research efforts as well?
A: It refers to both collaborative research the Science Collaborative has supported and other collaborative research efforts as well.

Q: To what extent can the Science Collaborative engage with a research team to shape a proposal?
A: We can answer questions about the RFP but cannot coach applicants in the development of their proposals.

Q: Is an optional, supplementary appendix permitted for supporting information such as figures, photos, and tables?
A: No. Please include all figures, photos, tables, and other illustrations within the 10-page narrative.

Q: Must the proposal narrative headers and their order be identical to what is laid out in the RFP, or is it possible to provide these in another order?
A: For ease of review, please do stick to the headers and their order as laid out in the RFP. To avoid repeating yourself, you can always direct readers to other places within the proposal if you need to reference something explained elsewhere in detail.

Q: How does a reserve go about applying for capacity building funds?
A: The Science Collaborative offers the opportunity for each reserve to receive up to $10,000 to enhance its capacity to develop competitive user-driven collaborative research and/or integrated assessment Science Collaborative proposals that address reserve management needs. More details can be found here. The application must come from a reserve and developed in close coordination with the reserve manager. If you are anticipating applying for funds, please contact at nerrs-info@umich.edu as soon as possible. Applications will be accepted on a rolling basis until September 30, 2018.

Q: Will end user interviews be part of the review process as in years past?
A: No. We know that asking end users to participate in the interviews takes social and political capital, and the energy and time of an entire proposing team. For these one-year projects, end user interviews are not part of the review process; instead, a letter of support

from at least one end user is required. Note that the RFP indicates specific items that the end user letter of support should indicate and make clear to the review panels.

Q: Will there be future opportunities offered through the Science Collaborative to apply for support for science transfer activities? Do you have suggestions for other ways to find support for this kind of work?
A: The last science transfer opportunity offered through the current iteration of the Science Collaborative occurred in the spring 2017. As for suggestions for other places to look for other ways to support science transfer work, try Sea Grant.