

FTS-NASA-VOICE

**Moderator: Lucien Cox
May 30, 2008
12:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in a listen-only mode. After the presentation, we will conduct a question and answer session.

To ask a question at that time, please press star then 1. This conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

I would now like to introduce Lucien Cox. Sir you may begin.

Lucien Cox: Good afternoon everyone that's on the net and just listening audio wise. We're here at NASA Headquarters, myself, Teresa Fryberger, Lawrence Freidl, Steve Ambrose and John Haynes. Woody Turner is on audio as well.

Thank you for joining this conference here for us to discuss our upcoming ROSES call. Briefly we're going to have - I'm going to the agenda if it will allow me. Here we are - a brief introduction by Teresa and welcome. Teresa will also do the program overview. We'll then have a brief introduction by the

Program Managers and then we'll get into the overview of the solicitation, some tips and suggestions and then we'll open it up for questions.

Just very briefly on logistics here. I'm sure that our coordinator has talked to you about the overall logistics. We'll do some questions after we get done with these few slides that we have.

We have allotted - we have set things up so we have about an hour and a half for questions. Answers to any questions that we're unable to answer today will be available on the NSPIRES Website. And of course we encourage you to review the solicitation completely for more information.

At this particular time, I would like the Program Managers to introduce themselves again and their areas of concentration.

Lawrence Friedl: Yes. Hello everyone. This is Lawrence Friedl. I'm the Program Manager for Air Quality Applications and I'm also helping to support the Climate Application area.

Steve Ambrose: Hi. It's Steve Ambrose here, Program Manager for Disaster Management and Water Resources.

John Haynes: This is John Haynes, Program Manager for Weather Applications as well as Public Health Applications.

Woody Turner: And Woody Turner, Program Manager for Ecological Forecasting and Acting for Agriculture.

Teresa Fryberger: And this is Teresa Fryberger. I'm the Director of the Applied Sciences Program. Oh. Repeat.

Man: (No, you go ahead).

Teresa Fryberger: Okay. I'd like to present - give you a brief overview of the program and then Lucien will talk in more detail about the solicitation. And then we'll take questions.

So I thought I would start at the very top to put our program in some context within NASA. I think as many of you know, NASA is still continuing its original mission to pioneer the future in space exploration, science discovery and aeronautics research.

In our strategic planning for NASA, they have several goals and science comes under Strategic Goal 3. And it says there to develop a balanced overall program of science and aeronautics. And under Strategic Goal 3 are the science goals of which there are four. And the one that we fall under is Study Earth from Space to Advance Scientific Understanding and Meet Societal Needs. And that's the Earth Science Division, which is where we sit.

And if you go to the next one. And under this Sub-goal 3 or under this Goal 3, and this Sub-goal 3A, which is earth science, there's some language about the applied sciences program. So that's where we sit in the strategic planning. And part of the reason that I'm telling you this is because you need to refer to this when you propose to us. You need to know where this fits in the strategic plan.

So let me talk a little bit about Earth Science Division and how Applications fits in. I think we all understand that all the components of the earth are related to each other and dependent on each other and interact in mysterious ways. And it's really understanding those interactions of the different

components of the earth that is a huge challenge and where I think NASA is uniquely situated because we study all of the components from space.

And we try to study the earth as a system, as a living system as opposed to a bunch of separate components. This approach that NASA uniquely takes really allows us to look at a broad range of application areas as we go into applications.

So next slide. The Earth Science Division also is an end-to-end division in the sense that we build the tools, we conduct the missions, we do the research and the applications and we make the data available. So those are really the activities of the Earth Science Division.

The Applied Sciences program is Number 4 and we discover and demonstrate practical applications of NASA earth science research and capabilities. Okay.

So going to applications now. Our goals are to expand the benefits of NASA earth science across a broad range of societal needs, to demonstrate new decision support tools for resource managers and policy makers for potential operational use, to provide the applications viewpoint in the design of new missions in research and to provide a strong interface to the external communities, the public, interagency community and policy and lawmakers.

We are really modeled after the group on earth observations concept and that is the taking of earth science and observations, putting them together and creating decision support tools for societal benefits. So we're - in the Earth Science Division we are focused on the right half of this chart. We are looking at how can we expand NASA earth science for societal benefits.

To do that, we work across what we might call the gap between research and applications or societal needs. So we can start with any number of research results; technology, missions, observations, data and archives, research and analysis, models, predictions and we can work across that gap and try to inform management decisions, policy decisions, forecasting and response and recovery.

In terms of organizations, we can't do this alone. There are whole - the whole basis of our program relies on partnerships. And that can be partnerships with all kinds of agencies at all different levels starting with Federal agencies who often have - who have operational responsibilities and have connections into states and regions through their state and regional offices.

We can also work directly with states and any of these organizations. We work with regional organizations, industry organizations. So it's a very - we sort of get it done however we need to get it done and with whatever partners. But the partnering is an essential part of the program.

We work across eight program elements. Some of you may know that we had 12 earlier. I don't think that going to eight has really excluded any areas. It more has grouped things together just for a little bit simpler program management.

There is one new area and that is climate. And I'll discuss that a little more on the next slide. The climate (applicatory) case scenario is new and I just want to speak a little bit about it for clarification. So we're really looking at climate change so that we can use earth science products to support policy, approaches, analyses, decisions that the nation might be considering as it responds to climate change.

So we can assess benefits and impacts of alternative policies and implementation approaches. We can incorporate long-range earth science predictions and models, predictive capabilities into decision-making. And we can address national to regional decision support activities in the applied sciences programs, carbon and energy management, applications, adaptation, mitigation and so forth.

I want to emphasize that we are not here to create policy or make policy. We are here to serve those that do that. So as you think about proposing - don't go there please.

And then my last slide really is to kind of talk about the program's operating guidelines so that you have a sense of what we're looking for. We focus on areas - we sort of have three criteria as it were.

First of all, all of our projects have to be utilizing NASA capabilities and expertise. We - I mean, that's our mission so that's kind of a necessity. There has to be a demonstrated and hopefully important societal need for our projects. And we have to have strong partners. We have to have receptivity to our technologies. So we look for those three things in every project.

We select projects through open competitive solicitations. We don't create new infrastructure for data or anything else that we don't need to. And finally, we define, and I think I've emphasized this, and identify our needs through our partnerships with organizations that have operational responsibilities.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Lucien to talk about the solicitation.

Lucien Cox: Hi. Thank you Teresa. Just moving on, I'll give an overview as briefly as I can making sure that we're touching on all areas of interest.

First of all, this first slide pretty much gives a description of the two areas that the solicitation supports, through use of science research results. A18 is really results-oriented projects that are focused on the integration of earth science research results into decision-making activities related to one or more of the eight application areas.

The A19 area of our feasibility studies in applications is meant to be more short-term and getting some - putting some studies together of these applications of earth science results that can improve decision-making activities that we have all come in contact with.

Under both areas, both the decision support projects and feasibility studies, we're looking for projects that enhance the performance of decision-making activities and any process through the integration of earth science projects. These decision-making - these decision-making activities may be existing or in development by the organization that operates or performs these processes.

The projects also can develop new capabilities for decision-making provided that activity can clearly be defined and the end users are strongly involved in the beginning all the way throughout the project and expressly committed to maintaining and supporting the effort and using decision-making activity that is being worked with.

A couple of general slides now that are involved with this solicitation. We recognize that there will be projects that have national impact and national importance.

We realize that there will be some regional and international efforts or aspects to these projects. But we would expect that the proposals would articulate the

national importance of the decision-making activity whether it's more of a regional effort or an international effort. And we would like to see and we would like it to be shown that the projects demonstrate progress throughout the project lifetime with regard to the national importance that has been described.

We would also ask that you document - that the improvements to the performance of the decision-making are documented, have some quantitative performance measures, and have a baseline for the performance.

The solicitations do not support basic science research. Research to integrate earth science projects in the decision tools that have been identified is fine. The solicitation is for new awards.

NASA will not accept proposals for successor proposals to solicited projects whose period of performance are ending or proposal for supplemental funding of existing efforts. The solicitation focuses on applying the current state of the knowledge and state of practice in earth science.

Project teams are encouraged for these - for these efforts. Organizations and collaborations spanning organizational sectors and expertise is where we're looking. These can involve academia, private, Federal, public and non-profit. We would expect that the expertise of these teams would be both technical management and have some science and research base as well.

We strongly encourage that non-Federal organizations also be parts of the team especially on the Federally led projects. This kind of helps provide some continuity to the NASA funding - when NASA funding has run out. End user organizations with the decision-making responsibilities must be explicitly identified and involved as active participants in the project.

Always try and be - creative in use of CoIs, collaborators, and advisors to play key roles in some areas that aren't always realized but are extremely important with regard to statistics, the economy and representatives from other key associations.

Lawrence Friedl: Can I just add...

((Crosstalk))

Lucien Cox: Yes you can.

Lawrence Friedl: The point behind this last in terms of being creative in the use of CoIs and collaborators and advisors is since we require quite a bit in these proposals in trying to look at some of the comparison between initial baseline conditions and using performance measures to articulate and document what the improvements in the decision-making activities would be through the use of earth science data.

We're suggesting that involving a statistician or an economist may be a creative way of using people who have expertise in doing performance measures types of activities and including them as a CoI/collaborator to help a team get to doing some of the performance measurement types of things that we're requiring in these proposals.

So this is something we've learned from doing a couple of solicitations. What we've seen successful proposals do and we want to offer it as a, you know, as something that others might want to consider in future proposals.

Lucien Cox: Thank you Lawrence for that clarification. Moving on now, just to give a sense of what we mean by the earth science products and research results since we have asked that the proposals include these, there can be a multiple of products and research results from other sources other than NASA products. These include:

Appropriate products, environmental data, other agencies, commercial entities or international organizations that have products relating to earth science, weather satellites and the model analysis and the models that are associated with earth science long-term environmental surface data records. European satellites can also be included. Consultation with or inclusion of satellite mission science team members on these proposals is very strongly encouraged.

New for this solicitation is, and I'm going to go through all these. Note that there's no requirement for an existing operational decision support system. That is, proposals can focus on working with operational partners in developing new decision support systems.

NASA tools can include current, upcoming and planned missions. We also are supportive and encouraging multiple principal investigators, operational PIs and research and project management PIs. This is a way of making sure that we have - we're covering the science, the technological base and some of the project management needs of these projects.

Research elements can now be included. However, any research proposed must be a necessary step toward achieving the application. So proposals that are research only will not - will be considered as non-compliant.

Lawrence Friedl: Lucien.

Lucien Cox: Yes.

Lawrence Friedl: On this slide for those that are viewing the slide, up top it says new for ROSES '08 and it's specified as A18 but I think that's for both A18 and 19.

Lucien Cox: Right. That was an oversight on my part.

Lawrence Friedl: So can you just clarify that it's - that this slide is for all of ROSES 18 and 19, not just for...

Lucien Cox: Right. When we are discussing the next element of this particular solicitation of feasibility studies, these points apply to that as well. It's not just indicative of the A18 elements. Thank you Lawrence again.

And in one other general point that is mentioned in the solicitation is that the application areas all had addressed climate issues in different ways. When you view the solicitation look over the different areas, you will see how the climate component is asked to be addressed in those application areas.

Climate application seeks to apply earth science products who help assess potential benefits and impact of possible policies that may exist. Proposal teams should first assess whether their proposal topic best aligns with one of the program elements. And we have in this box, it's better to focus on the decision-making activities rather than the type of earth science products that are going to be used.

Now we're going into specifically some areas, highlights of the A18 decision support elements. In general, the overall objectives are the sustained use of

earth science products and decision-making activities and assessment of the value and benefit of the earth science products.

All the proposals must demonstrate a strong interest in commitment by end users of the decision-making effort or activity to adopt the results from the proposed work assuming the project results are beneficial.

Some key considerations with the decision support element; again, results-oriented projects, targeted work rather than exploratory. There should be a means to an end. Just not exploring for the sake of exploring. Integration of earth science research results into decision-making activities.

One aspect that we are looking at very closely and are working with here at Headquarters in this program is a transition plan of these efforts; this is extremely important. We are emphasizing our focus on partners that have decision-making and resource management responsibility.

So we are - we would be looking for these projects to be - these project topics to be a priority in the organization that is doing and utilizing these decision-making activities.

Again, we'd like to have the improvements to be documented with regard to the performance of the decision-making that is being undertaken. And we would like to define a baseline for performance to enable analysis of the improvement.

Encourage use of array of the earth science results and in the solicitation, Section 1.3 has priority topics for each of the application areas. And if you have some further questions with regard to those, please contact the appropriate Program Manager for any clarifications you may have.

Oh this is nice. Didn't know that was going to happen. But anyway, got a little formatting issue here that I didn't expect to happen. What we have here is total funding for this effort and we are expecting anywhere from 20 to 23 projects. And these projects can be in a range anywhere from \$230K to \$310K per year.

Now, I want to mention to you, down below, the clarifying statement that - this represents a funding profile that we would see as an average year to year over the duration of the project. Period of performance is up to four (4) years and we're expecting these projects to start in the February timeframe. And contributions from partner organizations are strongly encouraged.

Apologize for the formatting there. That was something that just...

Steve Ambrose: (Didn't happen on mine.)

Lucien Cox: Yeah, it must be the screen resolution that I have here.

Lucien Cox: Okay. All right. Fine. All right. Very good then. Then it's only me. Good.

Moving into the feasibility element, we're - overall objectives here, we're - generated test preliminary ideas is for applications of earth science products to determine what their potential value and readiness for a more in depth project.

The objective of the proposed project must be to test the initial feasibility of a concept for potential applications of a specific NASA earth science research results in the decision-making activity that is being highlighted.

Some key considerations here for the feasibility efforts is short term and results oriented. We're looking for assessment, quantification, and documentation of the potential use of the products...

Lucien Cox: Identify uses for integration of products into decision-making. These projects can identify critical transition issues to address or to be addressed in a full project. Encourage use in array of earth science results as well.

And again the - Section 1.3 has priority topics in the application area and again, seek any clarifications that you may have or need. Innovation is always encouraged. And we are - we anticipate that some of these efforts may be higher risk but higher return also.

The total funding that we anticipate for these in fiscal '09 will be to the tune of a million dollars. We're expecting anywhere up to about 15 projects awards. The ranges of awards are as shown. Period of performance is 12 to 18 months. And we're expecting to start somewhere in the October, November timeframe. And again, contributions from partner organizations are of course encouraged.

(Going to move to) some tips and suggestions. These are some things that we've noticed from past discussions with our community and panels in evaluating these and we thought it would be a good time to go through these at this time.

First and foremost, please read the solicitation and the solicitation specific criteria very carefully and respond to the solicitation itself. Sections 4.4 and 4.5 are there to help the project teams prepare an applied sciences proposal. Specifically Section 4.4 deals with solicitation specific information for the content of proposal and of course 4.5 the specific criteria.

The next item, satellite systems and projects have limitations and we would like people's proposals to be very clear with regard to their understanding of the capabilities and the anticipated limitations of the sensors that they may request the use of the data from those sensors.

Please start early to develop well-constructed teams, partners, partnerships in the projects that you're considering or would like to construct. And incorporate well-conceived management approaches when doing so.

Inter-disciplinary teams are helpful. Involve end users in the project design. Include your CoIs and collaborators only as needed. Keep in mind the audience that you will have. We'd like you to not under price, but please do not over price. And again, please communicate with the Program Manager should you have any questions.

Just a couple more. Make sure your proposal is very legible, readable. Think about how you're going to document improvements in your decision-making efforts. As you can see, we're saying this a number of times, a number of ways. It's important to write down what you're proposed improvements may be to the decision-making effort.

Engage your researchers and science teams as appropriate. And we would like it to be shown that there's some substantive interest and involvement by the end users. We would hope and we would expect end users to be CoIs and collaborators on these efforts and indicate an interest in - indicate interest and commitment to use results in their decision-making on a sustained basis.

We would - and as far as letters with regard to this, we would like it to be a unique letter preferred to multiple letters with nearly identical words. We have

run into this in past solicitations. Identify efforts and activities that will benefit both partner organizations and the agency itself.

Lastly, familiarity with NASA's earth system science and results is of course important. Understand your community that you're working with. There again there's an array of research results that are available (simulated or from recently launched) for use from future or current missions, respectively.

Extend NASA's science products and decision support tools and again, our last one there, call on the Program Manager when you have some in depth questions.

At this particular time we're going to move into some questions from the body but before we do that, I'd like to open it up to any of the Program Managers or our Program Director if there's anything they would like to add at this particular time. Woody, you have anything? Okay.

Woody Turner: I'm good. (Thanks Lucien though).

John Haynes: I'd just like to remind people who are on the Web interface that to please use that to type in their questions. I only have three questions in queue right now. It'll be a lot easier for us to efficiently answer your questions if you're in front of a computer before we open all the lines. That could get kind of confusing with the number of people we have online. Just to remind people of that.

Lucien Cox: That would be good. Well at this time - go ahead Lawrence. I'm sorry.

Lawrence Friedl: And Lucien, the plan is to - I believe is to post this presentation on the program's Website, you know, hopefully by the end of next week if not sooner.

Lucien Cox: Right.

Lawrence Friedl: Okay. Great. And I'd just encourage people as they read through again to contact the Program Managers if they have any questions about the application areas or contact Lucien, Teresa or myself if you have general questions about ROSES '08 and the two elements for applied sciences.

Lucien Cox: Right.

John Haynes: And also remind everybody that not only will we have the presentation very soon but we'll also have a transcript of this teleconference as well as the questions asked and answers...

Man: Right.

John Haynes: ...posted as soon as we can get those together.

Lucien Cox: Absolutely. Well at this time if we've got some questions from people online...

John Haynes: Three in queue.

Lucien Cox: ...we've got three in the queue. I should be able to...

John Haynes: Look on question (unintelligible).

Lucien Cox: Let's go to - let's see.

John Haynes: We don't need that.

Lucien Cox: Okay. We don't need that one. All right.

John Haynes: (Don't know if we need that one too).

Lucien Cox: Yes. Why don't we - this is (Camille Dudan), we have your question here in view. If you could clarify what you mean here. We're sort of frowning here.

John Haynes: If you - if you just type a new question to the interface or - I mean, clarify your question you asked because we don't understand it. Go on to the next one.

Lucien Cox: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

John Haynes: Oh, they're backup slides.

Lucien Cox: Oh, right. We're reading (Robert Moorhead)'s question. There are a number of backup slides. I meant to mention that. After the question and answer period, there's a number of slides there.

John Haynes: You're going to need to read the question.

Lucien Cox: Yeah.

John Haynes: (Can't see the question).

Lucien Cox: Can't see - all right. This is a question from (Robert Moorhead). It says the Internet is showing you're only on Slide 33 of 44. What are the other slides?

The other slides are backup slides, information about the solicitation, some other information about the program itself, how the projects are rated.

So some that you have seen. Also there is some frequently asked question clarifications from some of the Program Manager elements that are there as well. That's what encompasses that particular body of slides.

Lawrence Friedl: So if I could just add Lucien. In the backup there are two particular slides that have questions that we've received that we posted clarifications on. One question was related to public health, one on water resources and two on disaster management.

When we post this presentation, you'll see those backup slides but those clarifications are also, you know, posted where you can - at the same place where you can get access to the proposal itself. I'm sorry, access to the solicitation itself.

Lucien Cox: Okay. Your next question we have is from (Vladimir Blonsky). His question, could you briefly describe the requested content of the NOI? We have a number of - I mean, any one of us can pretty much go through this. I don't know if we want to have a general answer, Lawrence or it's - go ahead.

Lawrence Friedl: Yeah, I would say that it could be a, you know, paragraph or two sort of general description of the project that you're going to be proposing; enough to give us a sense of the - to give us a sense of the project.

What we are going to be doing with the NOIs are two things. One is to get a general sense of the number of proposals in any one of the national application areas. One of the eight application areas. We want to get a sense of how many per application.

The second thing we're going to be doing is using the numbers of NOIs that come in to start scoping the review panels that we're going to be having in the September, October timeframe. So we're looking for some level of detail in the NOI about the projects. That would allow us to help know what are the sorts of people that we should be having on the review panels and how many and how large the review panels will need to be.

Lucien Cox: Okay. Thank you Lawrence. The next question from (Jim Aanstoos). Does the required level of involvement with end users differ between A18 and A19? Don't believe it should. It does? Clarification/explanation:

Lawrence Friedl: Yeah. Yes we expect that the end user involvement in A18 will be much more, much more significant than it will be for A19. A19 is sort of a, as Lucien mentioned, you know, sort of a preliminary test in feasibility of an idea. So we would expect someone to be certainly have engaged an end user to understand what a decision-making activity would be.

However, we do not expect the end users to be as involved in A19 feasibility study as they would be in a full-blown A18 type of project. We suspect that over the course of an A19 feasibility study and especially at the end that you would be sharing with the end users the results of the study whereas in A18 we expect the end users to be sort of pretty much engaged with the project at every step.

Lucien Cox: Our next question clarification - do I understand correctly that for A18 it is not necessary to have an existing DSS but exploring of potential DSS is a viable approach?

Lawrence Friedl: That is correct. And if you are going to be exploring and potentially creating a new decision support system, as the solicitation states, you need to have the end users, the ones with the decision-making responsibilities, you need to have them well engaged in the project.

You know, since they're the ones that have the decision-making responsibility, they should be helping to guide all along the way if their needs are being met and if the project is helping to serve the decision-making responsibilities that they have.

So the answer to the question is yes, you understand that correctly. You do not - it is not necessary to have an existing decision support system.

John Haynes: And this is an important point for people who have proposed especially before because this is different. We just want to point out again, you know, we had from the last three solicitations NASA applied sciences program was issued. So just, probably the biggest difference that we have.

Lucien Cox: Our next question. It was implied that A19 has to have an application component similar to A18 but the funding is much smaller. How much proof of application is requested for A19? Proof of application.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Lucien Cox: I don't know.

Lawrence Friedl: Let me - this is Lawrence. Let me - let me take another approach towards answering this question in terms of how much proof of application is required. Let me take it another way. Our sense is that at the end of an A19 project, our

program is going to do one of a number of things with the results of that project.

Based on the feasibility study, our program may decide to do a full-blown project based on the results. If it is successful, we may go ahead and just do a full-blown project on it. We may take it to the partner agency and say hey, this feasibility study shows some pretty good results. You might want to pursue a project with it.

Or we may take the results and take that idea and put it into the next ROSES solicitation as something where we want to get more full-blown project ideas in A18 type of setting. And so that's what we plan to do with a feasibility study that comes back positive.

And so the more fully that people can demonstrate and have performance measures that indicate that there is high potential to use an earth science product in a decision-making activity and that there's a, you know, positive potential and that the feasibility study shows there's positive potential. The greater extent that it can do that, the greater extent that we may pursue a more full-blown project on that. Is that...

Lucien Cox: Okay. Yeah.

Lawrence Friedl: If that did not answer the question, perhaps (Hal Robinson), perhaps you can re-clarify or restate your question if we did not answer it appropriately.

Lucien Cox: And moving on to the next question we have. If funding is requested for end user CoIs, is this frowned upon? Not at all.

John Haynes: It's perfectly appropriate. We will point - we need to point out that if any person being funded into the project, if they are a Government civil servant, NASA cannot pay salaries. We can also not pay salaries of foreign individuals as well.

So certainly funding requests for end user CoIs is not frowned upon, it's perfectly acceptable but it has to be within the Federal Government guidelines that are in the general guidance from the agency.

Woody Turner: John, this is Woody. I know that applies for foreign investigators. We have in the past I think paid Federal employee salaries. Now we may have changed our policy recently on that. But I believe we have for U.S. Government employees.

Teresa Fryberger: Woody, we can't do that.

Woody Turner: We can't pay civil servants salary.

Teresa Fryberger: No, we cannot pay civil servant salaries.

Lawrence Friedl: I think sometimes in the past we have. I think we're saying - I think what - I think the point Woody's making is that - or John's making is that - John and Teresa are saying that from now on we're not going to.

Woody Turner: Understand. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I understood.

Lawrence Friedl: So there is a change there.

Lucien Cox: Our next question. (Amelia Budd). Can an end user be the inter-Governmental panel on climate change to improve their scenarios and models?

Lawrence Friedl: I think we're almost looking at it the other way. We're hoping to use some of the scenarios and models that the IPCC has generated to see how decision-making officials could use the products from the IPCC.

So since - in my sense, I don't see the IPCC as a body that has a decision-making responsibility and so I would encourage people to use the models and scenarios that IPCC has generated to see how you could use those; not the other way around. Is that consistent Teresa?

Teresa Fryberger: Yeah. That's consistent. But I would say if you - if you have a question about that, it would be worth a call. If you think you have something that fits within our program structure that is for the IPCC - it's hard for us to imagine what that would be, but if you think you have something, I would encourage you to call either myself or Lawrence Friedl.

Lucien Cox: Our next question. Will decisions be solicited in ROSES '09?

Teresa Fryberger: That is the plan. That is the plan.

Lucien Cox: Next question we have. Can we submit two proposals for the A18 decision support who are assigned research results RFP?

Teresa Fryberger: Yes you may.

Lawrence Friedl: And actually we had that case in ROSES '07 where we had, you know, a couple times the same PI submitted more than one.

Lucien Cox: Lets see. This is back from (Jim Aanstoos) has another question. Is the use of future missions particularly encouraged in A19 proposals? Encouraged.

John Haynes: Yeah. I mean, it is. But the use of future missions is certainly very appropriate for A19 as we are using it for feasibility studies as we are looking ahead to the seven missions that will be launched by NASA over the next five years of how we can get a head start on being able to utilize once those are launched the data coming - data and observations coming from those missions.

And if you read in A19, I just know from my public health area, I mean, that's particularly what in A19 the public health focus area is looking at. We were requesting proposals investing in the benefits and impacts of future satellite observations and models. I have heard one person that's read that to mean future models. As I told them, I think that's kind of impossible.

So I mean current models, future satellites on decision-making areas - making the areas and especially these emergency preparedness and response and environmental health. So specifically in public health, but also in weather we're looking at. And I think that the solicitation as a whole that's a right area for feasibility studies as we're looking ahead to the future of what new areas to delve into.

Woody Turner: John, this is Woody. Ecological forecasting also calls for similar studies with simulator work towards pathfinders' future data.

Teresa Fryberger: I would add only that you ought to consider how future it is. We aren't going to be looking at the last few for example, things that will not be launched for 10 or 20 years. Obviously we would have a harder time with that.

Lawrence Friedl: And - this is Lawrence. I would say that while we certainly are encouraging people to be looking at, you know, future missions that we're also allowing and encouraging people to be looking at existing satellite data or other source of products. So this is not - it's not at the exclusion of current operating ones.

Lucien Cox: Your next question, (Michael Van Steinberg). Does no funding for civil servants apply to NASA civil servants?

Teresa Fryberger: No. No.

John Haynes: No. You can fund NASA civil servants. It's other than NASA civil servants.

Man: Right.

Lucien Cox: Next question we have is from (Cindy Smith). You mentioned that the funding guidelines for A18 are averages, not maximums. Does that mean that a proposal can be submitted with a first year request of say 400K if the total budget for all years falls with the 230 to 300K average?

Teresa Fryberger: You are correct in that what we are trying to do is provide you the flexibility to propose in a way that makes sense for you with the funding profile that makes sense. So we don't want to be - say it has to be this much every single year. But we do have an overall ceiling.

Lucien Cox: Okay. Thanks Teresa. We have gone through all the questions that are online here. I guess at this particular time, we can have people on the line ask some questions if that's appropriate for everyone since we've gone through these.

John Haynes: (Time to ask Torrey).

Lucien Cox: So (Torrey), if you could permit those online to answer some questions if they still have some.

Coordinator: Yes. Thank you sir. If you would like to ask a question from the phone line, please press star then 1. To withdraw your question, star 2. Once again, for a phone question, please press star then 1.

Our first phone question is from (Ed Sheffner).

(Ed Sheffner): Can I go ahead and ask my question now? Does this work?

((Crosstalk))

Lucien Cox: Yes it does (Ed).

(Ed Sheffner): Okay. The question on the A19. Since those are only for one year, is it possible to come back and there's only a limited amount that can be done in that year? Can - is there the potential for coming back in subsequent years with - to extend the work that was done during the one year or would that not be possible?

Teresa Fryberger: (Ed), first of all it goes up to 18 months. It's not one year. So these are for up to a year and a half. I believe that what we would ask - yes, there is a possibility to extend those through the proposal process for the - for a ROSES decisions type call that we would put out. So in other words, we would have a review of some - at some point, a peer review. But yes, there would be a possibility to extend.

Lawrence Friedl: If I can just add that I think the point of these feasibilities is to reach an end point where we as the program and whoever the PI are is to able to make a statement to say is there - is the potential for an application - what is the - first answer the question, what is the potential for a full blown application.

And so please remember that that's the point of what we're trying to achieve in a feasibility project is to answer the question is this worth going to a more full blown application project. You know, it's not meant to sort of continue funding for a project on and on.

Teresa Fryberger: Right.

John Haynes: And so if we felt that way, you would see in let's say ROSES '09...

Teresa Fryberger: Right.

John Haynes: ...a full three year blown A dot whatever amendment we'd have the time for the full three-year project. You would see we get these great feasibility studies on use of X. I'd like to do Y. You would see that asked for by one of the elements most likely.

Teresa Fryberger: These feasibility studies are really to allow people who may not have developed the partnerships that they need and who may need to have a little research component or test something out and also develop those partnerships over that period of time. So they can also be a little more risky from that point of view. But that's exactly right; we're looking to determine at the end whether this is worth pursuing as a full-blown application.

John Haynes: And I'll say from the point of view of the weather application specifically, as many of you all have noticed in the weather has evolved from aviation weather to a big concentration, yes, on aviation weather but looking at the potential of other economic sectors where weather is critical in decision support.

And so in A19 under weather specifically, it's a very open ended sentence of proposals investigating benefits to other specific economic sectors from weather forecasts and observations specifically those derived from next generation satellites. Because we are trying to determine where our other economic sectors at the weather application may delve into beyond aviation.

So these feasibility studies are actually ought to be used to help develop future directions as well for the weather program at least.

Lawrence Freidl: And I think to also answer your question. I think when we get to the end of the feasibility study, the end of the 18 year timeframe, we as a program will, as Teresa said, will sort of assess where that project is and at that point will make the determination of whether we want to be taking that idea into ROSES or whether we want to be working with that PI to work it into a more full blown project topic.

So it's not a guarantee that if it's a successful project that we're going to necessarily stay with the same PI. But obviously if we put into ROSES for the next ROSES call, that PI and that PI team would definitely have an advantage. Does that answer your question (Ed)?

(Ed Sheffner): Yes, it does. I have another one but I'll wait my turn.

Coordinator: Once again, to ask a question, please press star then 1. You'll be announced prior to asking your question.

The next question is from (Negley Crotka).

(Negley Crotka): Hello. I work with (unintelligible). We currently have an application (again) with (NOR) to provide NASA two measurements (unintelligible) with

decision support (unintelligible). And the project ends next year and my question is if it would be appropriate to re-propose this time under this solicitation?

John Haynes: No, under the A18, I'm supposing you're talking about A18. There's two problems there. But one is we're looking for not extensions of current work being done that has been solicited by NASA.

So it would have to be - it certainly can be from the same team, we're not saying that. But on a new issue, new topic, new decision support tool. Something new. It couldn't be an extension of current work. That's in general. B, as specifically in ROSES '08, A18 in the weather section, we are discouraging proposals on volcanic ash impacts to aviation because of Dr. (Kruger)'s current project and other ones we have done in the past.

We've done quite a bit of work there and in the spirit of portfolio balance, we are trying to in that area and as well as icing impacts aviation, we're discouraging those this year to get a better balance in other areas of principal weather and other areas with numerical weather modeling and use the (thorpex) modeling information. So hopefully that answers the question.

Lawrence Freidl: In addition to - because earlier we mentioned that the A18 projects need very targeted efforts trying to get to a specific end state by the end of the project. That's why we want the current projects to be managed to reach an end state and so if you're going to be proposing something new, we want that to be a new effort, a new targeted effort to reach some new end state.

And that's why we're not - that's why we discourage and don't allow for just mere extensions of a current project because we want current projects to reach the end state that they had originally proposed. So as John said, you know, the

same team can re-propose but it would have to be a new project, not just an extension of an existing one.

(Negley Crotka): Can I have an additional question?

Lucien Cox: Sure. Go ahead.

(Negley Crotka): In terms of new elements, would be applying our techniques to the new missions which allows for example we can do it once a day right now. Extending these capabilities decisions supposed to do it twice a day or doing night and day up to four times a day. Would it be considered a new effort or just an extension of what we have done so far?

John Haynes: I think - we'd have to know more I think to answer the question. You know, I think it would be best if you would call - if it's in volcanic ash and aviation weather to call me offline.

(Negley Crotka): Thank you.

John Haynes: This is John Haynes. Because it would depend on some particulars of the project that it'd be glad to discuss offline.

(Negley Crotka): Thank you very much.

Lawrence Freidl: And if others have a similar type of question for another project, call the Program Manager. We've given the sort of general information, general answer. If you've got specifics, please call us so that, you know, we can answer it specifically.

Coordinator: Your next question is from (Ed Sheffner).

(Ed Sheffner): Hello again. This is also related to A19. It's a two-part question. One is that - the first part is that - would it be responsive to the call under A19 to propose a development of a tool that would take data from more than one orbiting NASA instrument and develop a tool that could be used in say association with ground data to address a particular - one of the topic areas?

And the second part is how stringent is that upper limit on the funding for that - for A19? If we go say up to 150 for the 18-month period, would that be considered non-responsive and thrown out by the panel or would it still be considered?

Lawrence Friedl: (Ed) this is Lawrence. To answer the first part of the questions that there needs to be some connection to the decision-making activity and so if you're talking about a tool that is going to be combining data that will be extended in the course of the feasibility project into a decision-making activity, then, you know, that would be appropriate.

Again, the feasibility is sort of to try to assess the potential of some of these products to support the decision-making rather than tool development.

(Ed Sheffner): Well, sometimes you need the tool in order to assess the suitability of the data into the decision-making process.

Lawrence Friedl: I realize and therefore I was saying that if you're developing the tool in order to test the feasibility of those data products in the decision-making, that is acceptable. In your initial question you did not make the link to decision-making and so it sounded like just a tool for tool sake.

(Ed Sheffner): No that was my being ambiguous. It would certainly be related to a specific decision-making process.

Lawrence Friedl: Then I think that would be appropriate. Related to the money, we are looking for people to scale the project to the funding levels that we've articulated and so, you know, I think 150 is outside our bounds and that we're really looking for people to scope the level of effort to the funding that's available so that they really have some very targeted feasibility studies.

(Ed Sheffner): Okay. Thank you.

Lawrence Friedl: I mean, we'll still review it, but what we may do is in negotiation knock it down to the level that we've, you know, that we've articulated to everyone else.

(Ed Sheffner): Okay. Actually I found your first answer a little bit easier to deal with than the second.

Lawrence Friedl: You're not the first to ask that question. So we anticipated it.

(Ed Sheffner): Thank you Lawrence.

Coordinator: Our next question's from (David Trolley).

(David Trolley): I have two questions. If you guys could talk a little bit about the review process for the feasibility study as opposed to the A18. And then John mentioned some things that were not being sought in his program like volcanic ash or some other things.

Is there a way that you guys could convey to proposers what your portfolio looks like and be a little bit clear about where you're looking for projects?

For example, when the announcements were made on the last call, the last ROSES, there were a lot of projects like in the area of drought monitoring that kind of surprised me because I thought we had plenty in that area already. So is there a table or matrix or what's the best way to convey that to potential proposers?

John Haynes: As far as the areas of, you know, within our portfolio that we are looking for, we articulate that in the solicitation. If you read the solicitation for each one of our elements, in it we encourage each one of them separately, or discourage certain topics based on what our current portfolio is or where the Program Manager wants to take the program based on current national priorities.

So I would encourage to read that first and if there's still questions, certainly can contact the appropriate Program Manager and they can discuss more fully with you the scope of their current program.

Lawrence Friedl: Was that not clear enough (Dave) in terms of what's listed in the A18 or A19?

(David Trolley): Well, I'm remember some program elements that there were some focus areas, but I guess short of just going to the inspire site and looking at what projects are currently funded, that would be a good way for proposers to see what's already being funded under the program on a specific project basis as opposed to, you know, thematically.

So, but I guess - okay. Well we'll make sure we read that carefully. If any questions, talk to the Program Managers.

And the other question was on the review process for the feasibilities. Those tend to seem to be more programmatic than a broad based review panel kind of - maybe you can comment on that.

Lawrence Friedl: Yeah, our plan for A19 is to conduct a mail review for those proposals and then most likely, I mean depending on the numbers that we get in, most likely we'll have a sort of a telecon review with the people that did the mail reviews. And that we're hoping it's going to be a much more expedited review process.

It's still going to have the same criteria. You can still, you know, look at A19, look at the review criteria that we're going to be using. But we suspect that that's going to be done via mail review and telecon rather than a physical panel that sits. One thing that - so yes, I think that's how we're planning to - we're planning to do that.

(David Trolley): Now one other thing is it seems like you're going to select about 20 or so A18s but half as many A19s. And I would have personally speculated that you were going to get many more A19 proposals than A18s. What are your comments on that? In other words, is it competitively harder to get an A19 than an A18?

Teresa Fryberger: Well (Dave), we don't really know the answer to that yet because this is the first time that we've tried it.

(David Trolley): Right.

Teresa Fryberger: So it's - I can certainly envision that it's possible we would get - it would be harder to win an A19 because we would get more proposals.

(David Trolley): Okay.

Teresa Fryberger: I wouldn't want to say that (our priority) because we just haven't tried it before.

(David Trolley): Okay.

Teresa Fryberger: And I think that the reason we're doing it the way we're doing it is to balance our own portfolio. We don't want all of our - we don't want a large portion of our projects to be really early phase exploration. We would - we need to have that balance. So it's not likely that we're going to be shifting our resources in some huge way towards many more of those and fewer of the full-blown.

(David Trolley): Okay. Fair enough.

Lawrence Friedl: (And am) I going to add to that - you know, depending on what we get in and what funding looks like throughout the rest of '08 and going into FY09, you know, if - depending on funding situations, it may be that - if we are to identify new funding, it may be that we could put more towards A19 or for that matter, we could put more towards A18 depending on the sort of response we get for each one of those solicitations.

So the numbers that we have in there, the five million per year for A18 and the one million for A19 I think are the, at least the minimum levels. We're certainly hoping that we might be able to find some other funds to select more. But that's sort of the backstop.

(David Trolley): Okay.

Lucien Cox: I just wanted - this is Lucien. I just want to say is it fair to say Teresa and Lawrence and everyone here, depending on the number of A19s that we get,

they could be an augmentation to some of the other A18s that we get to applications program depending on what they are.

I mean, say for instance, we get a lot but maybe we've - it would depend on what the panel comes up with and what areas they're in. It could serve as an augmentation to what we're selecting in the other element area. And we may see that that might be something we'd want to look to in future ROSES. I'm not sure.

Teresa Fryberger: I'm not sure I'm following that. But I will say that we try - we do the best we can to be flexible for proposals to fit if they are good proposals. And so, you know, this is our - what we're telling you about are standard procedures and how we try to operate the program.

(David Trolley): Okay.

Teresa Fryberger: There are always a few that need to be operated slightly differently and we try to do that.

Lucien Cox: We have another question that has come online that I'd like everyone to hear. I think it's fairly pertinent for us to give an answer here. And this is again from (Jim Anstose). It says are we allowed to partner with DOD agencies without civil servant salaries?

Teresa Fryberger: Yes.

Lucien Cox: Okay.

Teresa Fryberger: Definitely. They're Federal employees.

Lucien Cox: Okay.

Lawrence Friedl: And the eligibility section I think articulates the fact that it's open to all organizations are allowed. So we certainly include DOD in all organizations. And it does not include - and I think in the past our program has sort of had the impress that it has to be a Federal agency - a Federal agency has to be involved and while that certainly is permitted, that it's certainly not absolutely required.

So, you know, a partner does not have to be a Federal agency. But I think on the slide that Teresa showed earlier, you know, we are looking for organizations that have networks to - networks to end users. It's an efficient way of using, you know, NASA resources to reach a broader audience. And so...

Teresa Fryberger: Yeah, I think that confuses people. We say that we want projects that have potential national impact, but that doesn't mean that you have to be working with a national partner. You could be working with a regional office of a Federal agency or a regional organization or a state office.

The idea is primarily that what you are doing isn't a one off thing or even a two off thing. That it's something that has the potential to be utilized nationally. And the reason that we have that is primarily because we are a Federal agency with a national mission.

Lawrence Friedl: So for example, this last time we funded the regional green house gas initiative which is involving 10 states in the Northeast. We've also got some activities going on with the Gulf of Mexico alliance, which is the five Gulf of Mexico states.

And, you know, we have a number of other examples where, you know, I think it's easy to argue that the Gulf of Mexico is in the national interest, you know, as a regional entity. And so those are some examples of working at - working on an issue that is of national importance but not necessarily with a national organization.

Are there other questions or people on the telephone?

Coordinator: We do have another phone question from (Jerome Trimmay).

(Jerome Trimmay): Hi. My question is a clarification on an earlier statement regarding the prohibition of paying salaries for civil servants. Is that just Federal civil servants or does that extend to state and other levels?

Teresa Fryberger: Just Federal.

(Jerome Trimmay): Okay. Thank you.

Teresa Fryberger: I think the reason for that probably stems from the Federal - Federal employees are already paid by the Federal Government and it's a way to keep the different agencies separate.

Coordinator: For any other phone questions, please press star then 1.

At this time I don't show any phone questions.

Lucien Cox: Well at this time since we have no more phone questions and it appears we have exhausted the question online.

Teresa Fryberger: (We just got one) (unintelligible.)

Lucien Cox: Oh, and as I said that, (Howell Robinson) has just come back with a question. So let me read what that one says. It says how do you select the national application area that the proposal should be submitted to in NSPIRES if your project spans two areas.

For example, we have two end users communities' ecological modeling/conservation and disaster management. The DSS falls under disaster management.

Lawrence Friedl: I can say that on the NSPIRE's Website or the cover page, you're able to select up to two national application areas. And so first of all, you know, you can identify both of them. If your project falls under more than two, then I would say enter in the top two ones.

What we typically do here when we receive the proposals is we'll - as we read through them, we also are trying to get a sense of which application it falls in and to determine which panel is going to be reading that proposal.

And if we determine either based on the application areas that the PI identifies or based on our reading of a particular proposal, if we feel that it needs to be reviewed by more than one panel, we certainly will have that reviewed by more than one panel.

And so that's - I think we allow that. And in terms of how your (specific) question how do you select that one, I would say we leave that to your judgment in terms of which one you think is more particular to having read the particular language in the solicitation. But if it falls under more than one, please identify that and we'll know to specifically read it to potentially have it reviewed by more than one panel.

Teresa Fryberger: This is yet another reason that we encourage people to call the Program Managers. It's very difficult to get all of the information and everybody's questions answered in the solicitation itself. And so I encourage people with any kind of specific questions to make those calls.

John Haynes: And I'll point out that in the presentation we opened up with on Slide 22, we kind of state succinctly to focus on the decision-making activity rather than the type of earth science product to use when determining which application to put as your priority area.

Lucien Cox: Okay. At this time we don't have any more questions. I'll just reiterate that the presentation transcript of this telecon and the recording will be available on our Website once we receive that. Thank you all for participating. Your question were insightful and again thanks a lot. Have a good weekend and we'll talk to you soon.

Coordinator: Thank you for participating on today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

END