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Portfolio Review Timeline

- September 2011: Start
- April 2012: 3rd of 3 face-to-face meetings
- July 31 2012: Final draft report submitted
- August 16, 2012: MPS Advisory Committee telecon and vote to transmit to MPS
- August 31, 2012: MPS/AST Response posted
- Nov. 2012: MPSAC update on response
Basic Recommendations

- At either of two hypothetical budget levels, recommended facility divestments are the same
  - Driven by dangers of over-optimism, time scale for facility shifts
  - For more pessimistic budget, funding recommended for facilities, midscale, and individual investigator awards (IIA) are all at ~75% of FY10-12 level

- Facility recommendations
  - Priority 1 (Fund): ALMA, ATST, VLA, LSST (operations start in 2020), CTIO, Gemini-S, Dunn Solar Telescope (until ~2017)
  - Priority 2 (Keep for now, possibly re-visit later): Arecibo, SOAR, Solar synoptic, Gemini-N
  - Priority 3 (Divest expeditiously): McMath-Pierce Solar Telescope, federal telescopes on Kitt Peak, Green Bank Telescope, Very Long Baseline Array

November 2012
NSF Response to PR Report

- NSF response document (4 pages) issued on August 31.
- NSF must decide on nature of divestments near the end of CY 2013 in order to realize significant savings by FY 2017.
  - No decisions have been made by NSF; discussions within NSF will lead to future budget requests, which are then subject to action by Congress.
  - Divesting a telescope does not need to imply closing a site.
  - Emphasize principle of divestment in a responsible manner.
  - Open to creative partnerships, bridge funding, etc.
- Agree with Committee assessment that failure to act on their recommendations will reduce IIA program four-fold in Scenario B.
  - Resulting IIA funding rate would be in 3%-4% range.
  - This funding rate would essentially end NSF individual investigator funding of the U.S. astronomy community.
  - Committee found this risk unacceptable; AST agrees.
- Competed midscale program will depend on available funding.
Impact of Maintaining Status Quo

PR Fig. 3.4

Status Quo Facilities+URO:
No LSST or other new initiatives or upgrades
Ongoing Activities by NSF

- Many briefings have been conducted, with Congressional staff, OMB, OSTP, NASA, DOE, professional society stakeholders, NRC and other advisory committees, astronomy department chairs, community webinar, etc.

- Facility managers have been requested to provide more detailed budget breakdowns, assessment of partnership opportunities, and related issues.
  - The management organizations consider much of this information to be competition-sensitive.

- NSF is assessing detailed financial and legal implications of possible divestments, including items such as environmental issues and potential transfer costs.

- NSF is simultaneously carrying out discussions with DOE regarding assets that DOE may wish to use for mission-specific experiments.

- Discussions will lead to selections among various options.