

FAQ SciDAC

Correction to LAB 17-1682 and SC FOA 0001682: The initial postings for 1682 had an error in the Summary, with 1682 having a duplication of the Summary in 1681. These have been corrected and reposted. The Summary for 1682 should read as follows:

“This BER-ASCR SciDAC Partnership opportunity will enable scientists to conduct complex scientific and engineering computations at a level of fidelity needed to simulate real-world climate conditions, by supporting deep, necessary, and productive collaborations between climate scientists on the one hand and applied mathematicians and computer scientists on the other, that overcome the barriers between these disciplines and consequently fully exploit the capabilities of DOE HPC systems in order to accelerate advances in climate science. This SciDAC opportunity invites creative and innovative pilot approaches to climate model component design that are mindful of leading edge computer architectures. The next-generation climate model capabilities will contribute to the newly launched Accelerated Climate Model for Energy (ACME) and further its progress toward design of climate codes for leadership class computers and in support of energy science and mission requirements.”

SciDAC Institutes: 1. In SciDAC-3, collaboration with “Institutes” was mandatory. In SciDAC-4, with whom should we collaborate? 2. Is it necessary that collaborators are a) ASCR-funded or b) DOE-funded?

Answer:

1. While collaboration with the SciDAC-3 Institute personnel isn’t mandatory in SciDAC-4, collaborators (and collaborations) must meet all of the criteria stated in the solicitations for proposals in order to be considered responsive. The SciDAC-3 Institute web pages are referenced in all of the solicitations as suggested resources. Many SciDAC-3 Institute personnel are still interested in collaborating with scientists on SciDAC-4 proposals.
2. No to both a) and b). On the other hand, all of the solicitations contain statements to the effect that a record of funding from ASCR may be regarded as evidence of relevant experience.

Funding limits: Suppose that a PI plans to obtain additional funds for a SciDAC Project from another part of DOE or another agency which is not a sponsor of the FOA. Should that additional support be included in assessing whether the funding limits specified in the FOA have been exceeded?

Answer: No. The funding limits quoted in the solicitation only apply to the combined funding of the Offices within the Office of Science that sponsored the FOA. However we do request that any such “external” sources of support and their associated scope be specified in the proposal.

Funding Range: The floor is 500k per collaboration per year, does this include the entire project and all institutions?

Answer: Yes

Is there a floor for individual institutions within the collaboration?

Answer: No

Time commitments: Do required time commitments for Lab personnel in the LAB Announcements apply across all of the SciDAC Partnership solicitations?

Answer: No, only to the Partnerships with BER (1681 and 1682). In particular the time commitment requirement is not intended to limit participation by those who intend to collaborate with scientists responding to other SciDAC Partnership solicitations (e.g., Nuclear Physics, High Energy Physics, Fusion Science, etc.)

Collaboration: For FOA1682, is it required that University investigators collaborate with DOE-Laboratory scientists?

Answer: No

Scope of 1682: Does the proposed work have to be model development, or can it be packages for testing and understanding the model performance against the observations?

Answer: It would be very challenging to write a competitive proposal that would address the following Topic-description without including significant model development: "Pilot projects are invited to develop "next-plus-2" components or major capabilities for ACME (i.e. v4). The proposal should make the case that these major developments are expected to lead to significantly improvements in: fidelity, coupled-system climate predictability and computational performance. High-risk, high-pay-off approaches are encouraged. New algorithms and code-structures should be explored that would take advantage of the newest available architectures and include forward-looking designs to the extent possible."

Pre-proposal page-limits: Do the cover-page title/PI info/budget table and the list of collaborators also need to fit into the two page project description?

Answer: No

1682 LAB and FOA relationship: For a collaboration involving DOE-Labs and Universities applying to the 1682 call, which call does the team apply to?

Answer: The companion calls are split between a FOA and a LAB Announcement to accommodate the differing eligibility requirements and funding mechanisms. The Lab applicants should send their proposal to the LAB17-1682 call, the University applicants should send their application to the FOA-0001682. Only one of these will be the lead institution, but the collaborating institutions would send their applications to their respective call (Labs to the LAB and Universities to the FOA), as described in the announcements.

Proposal narrative page limit: There is a discrepancy on the page count on page 19 of both LAB calls. On page 19 of both calls, it says:

“Project Narrative (main technical portion of the proposal, including background/introduction, proposed research and methods, timetable of activities, and responsibilities of key project personnel – 10 page limit)”

which contradicts the later instructions of 25 and 20 pages for the narrative in the two calls.

Which is correct?

Answer: The latter number (25 and 20 for LAB-17-1681 and LAB-17-1682 respectively).