



Updates on PAPPG Changes

Uma D. Venkateswaran
Program Director, NSF EPSCoR

uvenkate@nsf.gov

703-292-7732

2013 Winter PD/PA Meeting,
Newark, DE

January 23, 2013



Topics

- Recent changes to PAPPG
 - Proposal preparation/submission
 - Merit review
 - Other changes
- Proposal compliance
- Budget



NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG)

<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappguide/nsf13001/>

NSF 13-1 issued on Oct. 4, 2012, and effective for proposals submitted or due on or after Jan. 14, 2013

- Summary of Significant changes
 - Part I: Grant Proposal Guide
 - Part II: Award & Administration Guide



PAPPG Changes

- Project Summary, Description Requirements, Biographical Sketch changes
- Proposals Not Accepted (increased clarity)
- Proposal Certifications (Organizational Support)
- Implementation of Merit Review Criteria
- Indirect Costs
- NSF Award Cash Management Service (ACM\$)



Project Summary

- Not to exceed one-page (4,600 total characters incl. spaces); requires three text boxes in FastLane;
 - Overview
 - Statement on Intellectual Merit
 - Statement on Broader Impacts
- Proposals with special characters may upload Project Summary (one-page) as a PDF document
- All three text boxes must be filled out or a project summary (with special characters) must be uploaded; otherwise FastLane will **not** accept the proposal.



Project Description

- Must contain a separate section with a discussion of the broader impacts of the proposed activities
- Results from Prior Support (if any) must address intellectual merit and broader impacts

Organizational Support Certification

Requires AOR certification that organizational support will be made available as described in the proposal to address the broader impacts and intellectual merit activities to be undertaken



Biographical Sketch(es)

The “Publications” section of the Biosketch has been renamed “Products”.

- This change makes clear that products may include, but are not limited to, publications, data sets, software, patents, and copyrights.

References cited

If there are no references cited, a statement to that effect should be included in this section.



Cost Sharing

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited in solicited & unsolicited proposals, unless approved in accordance with agency policy

Senior Personnel (in budget)

- If no person months are requested for senior personnel, remove their names from the budget
 - Describe role of senior personnel in the Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources section of the proposal
- Names of senior personnel will remain on the coversheet



Facilities, Equipment & Other Resources

- A required component of the proposal
- Provide an aggregated description of the internal and external resources (both physical and personnel) that the organization and its collaborators will provide and are directly applicable to the project
- Do not include any quantifiable financial information
- If there are no resources to describe, a statement to that effect should be included in this section of the proposal and uploaded into FastLane



Required Sections of the Proposal

- Cover Sheet – including certifications
- Project Summary
- Project Description – including Results from Prior NSF Support
- References Cited
- Biographical Sketch(es)
- Budget and Budget Justification
- Current and Pending Support
- Facilities, Equipment & Other Resources
- Supplementary Documentation
 - Data Management Plan
 - Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan (where applicable)
 - Others as required in the solicitation



Proposals Not Accepted

- Formally recognizes a new category of non-award decisions and transactions: Proposal Not Accepted
- Is defined as “FastLane will not permit submission of the proposal”
- Proposal will not be accepted if
 - Data Management Plan or Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan (or both) are not present
 - Project Summary does not conform to PAPPG guidelines



Proposals Involving Vertebrate Animals

- Proposals involving the study of wildlife
Organizations must establish and maintain a program for activities involving animals in accordance with the National Academy of Science publication, *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*
(http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12910)



Merit Review

- NSB Task Force (spring 2010) to examine review criteria and underlying principles; consider revisions, as needed
- Used stakeholder input (interviews, survey, NSF website); NSB approved Report (January 2011)
<http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/publications/2011/meritreviewcriteria.pdf>
- Report's Recommendations:
 - Three guiding review principles, Two review criteria, and Five review elements
- Implementation for proposals submitted or due on or after Jan 14, 2013



Merit Review Implementation

- Guiding Principles, Review Criteria, and Review Elements incorporated into PAAPG (GPG Chapter III)
- Reviewer and Panelist Letters
 - Give due diligence to the three Merit Review Principles
 - Evaluate against the two Merit Review Criteria
 - Consider the five review elements in the review of both criteria
- Panel and Proposal Review Form in FastLane
 - Updated to incorporate consideration of review elements in addressing the two criteria
 - Text box added for reviewers to address solicitation-specific criteria



Merit Review – Principles

- All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- NSF projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals.
- Meaningful assessment and evaluation of NSF funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects.



Merit Review - Criteria

Reviewers are asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit:** encompasses the potential to advance knowledge
- **Broader Impacts:** encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes



Merit Review - Elements

The following elements should be considered in the review for **both criteria**:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to:
 - a. advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit);
 - b. benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?



Merit Review – Elements (cont'd)

3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or institution to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home institution or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?



Merit Review – other changes

- Examples of Broader Impacts document has been deleted
- FastLane help updated for reviewers



Merit Review Resources

- NSF Merit Review Website
 - www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/
- Resources for the Proposer Community
 - www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/resources.jsp



Indirect Costs

- Institutions must use the applicable indirect cost rate (F&A) that has been negotiated with the cognizant federal agency.

Exceptions as noted in the *Grant Proposal Guide*:

- Participant support section
 - International Travel Grants Section or
 - In a specific program solicitation
- Foreign grantees and subawardees also are generally not eligible for indirect cost recovery.



Awardee Cash Management Service (ACM\$)

- ACM\$ will replace the current FastLane Cash Function
- When implemented, NSF will discontinue payments under the cash pooling method (lump sum basis)
- Requires award level detail with each payment request
- Implemented in Research.gov with all awardees required to use by April 2013

http://www.research.gov/researchportal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Generic/Common/WhatisACM.html



ARRA Acceleration:

NSF Implementation of OMB M-11-34

- Responsible expenditure acceleration efforts to conclude ARRA spending by 9/30/2013
- Already Informed - Grantee approved no-cost extensions (NCE)
 - ARRA grantees may ONLY issue themselves NCE through 9/30/2013, but NOT beyond 9/30/2013



Compliance issues

- Cover Page: Human subjects box, Institutional Review Board
- References cited: do not use 'et al.' (required section)
- Bio Sketches: do not exceed number of 'products,' do not use 'et al.,' provide names and current affiliations of advisors/ advisees and # of grad students and postdocs (use 'none' if applicable); Avoid using scanned or bitmapped bio-sketches
- List of Conflicts: include External Advisory Board members, Evaluators



Budget issues

- Consistent with proposed project activities and clearly justified
- Senior Personnel salary – specify calendar, academic, summer months; more than 2 months (from all NSF sources), if anticipated, must be disclosed and justified
- Provide correct number of Other Personnel, Participants
- Administrative and Clerical salaries (usually indirect costs); if direct cost, clearly describe and justify
- DGA contact (for EPSCoR): Willie Mae Powell



Thank you

