

Generic notes for all project teams – Please review these notes carefully before preparing your Phase 2 response: Overall Phase 1 requests exceed total available resources, so some adjustments are necessary. Please review the information below ahead of preparing your Phase 2 response, and feel free to ask the Management Team (MT) for clarifications should questions arise. Project-specific feedback follows this general information.

Ratings

There is no need to prepare a Phase 2 response for those projects given a “1” rating. Nevertheless, be aware that while the MT fully supports the proposal as-is, it is possible budget cuts may be necessary pending final budget, labor, and ship time balancing.

A rating of “2” means some action or response from the project team is required. In most cases, the MT has made specific recommendations that are needed to support a modified version of the project plan, and the project team is asked to implement those changes. In other instances it may be possible for the project team to suggest alternative project revisions, and these will be considered during Phase 2 reviews. If you plan to suggest project revisions differing from those requested by the MT, you are encouraged to discuss those changes with a member of the MT prior to submitting your Phase 2 response.

A rating of “3” means the project will not be supported in 2018 and so no response is needed.

Direct expenses - general

Total requests exceed available funds by >\$1.7 million and so an overall budget reduction during Phase 2 is necessary. Please review your budget requests carefully to determine if any savings are possible, and if so, revise your budget accordingly. In some cases, the MT feedback provides specific suggestions/guidance/instructions on reductions for Phase 2, but all project teams are also asked to consider ways to reduce costs where possible and appropriate.

Direct expense - travel

Travel expense requests to attend AGU in Washington, D.C. and Ocean Sciences in Portland, OR will be standardized across all projects. Please adjust travel expense requests for AGU/Washington, D.C. to \$3,000 per traveler. Requests for travel to Ocean Sciences/Portland should be \$2,300 per traveler. Registration fees are \$500 for both conferences. Also note that MBARI has pre-paid 25 registrations for the Deep-Sea Biology Symposium. Please take note of comments related to a request to attend that meeting if you have included it in your project budget.

Labor hours

Accounting has determined a target number of total hours available by individual across projects. This number takes into account accrued vacation time, holidays, sick leave, other leave, etc. Feedback may include a request to alter hours to reach this target number. Note that this number is for budget purposes only and actual charges may differ, although a review of historic charges indicates these numbers are close to historical

hours actually charged to projects. The target number will continually be fine-tuned to be able to more accurately forecast hours charged to projects.

Engineering

As in previous years, requests for engineering time exceed the number of allocable hours. Please ensure that requests have been carefully scoped and, if possible, reduce those requests. Where applicable, prioritize engineering tasks and indicate in your response which tasks may be deferred or removed. Please see Doug Au if you have any questions or need further information.

Some reductions/changes in engineering resources have already been identified by the MT. These changes are detailed in the project-specific feedback below. Please review these changes carefully and enter these revisions in the budget system, as appropriate, for your project. If there are concerns about the suggested changes to resources or project scope thus far, please include details in your Phase 2 response and provide justification for any requests. Again, please reach out to your MT contact if you would like to discuss your response prior to the Phase 2 deadline.

Video Lab

Video lab support will cover the 2018 project requests for annotation; however we are unlikely to be able to accommodate as many requests for video lab to provide shipboard support at sea in 2018.

Final notes

Please be sure to enter all budget revisions (labor, ship, expense) in the web budget system, as necessary, prior to the Phase 2 deadline (Thursday, September 7 at 8:00 a.m.).

All written Phase 2 responses should be sent directly to Mandy Allen via email.

901206 Coastal Profiling Float Transition to Science Applications

Rating: 2

MT contact: Scholin

Management Team Feedback***General Comments:***

Thank you for the update. It appears you are making steady progress.

As we noted during the abstract phase of the 2018 RFP, we sense there's a strong desire to begin science operations (and we share your enthusiasm) but some elements of the development appear to require further work before the CPF is ready for prime time. The "optimization" needed is not necessarily trivial. We feel there should be a concerted

focus on demonstrating that the existing fleet of 3 CPFs can be operated reliably, and their array geometry controlled appropriately before building more.

This project appears to be well poised for seeking external support to build the additional 2 CPFs that are needed for undertaking a targeted science experiment, such as the one you outlined that could take place off Oregon in 2019. MBARI has invested a great deal in this development over the years, and with the progress to date as well as a successful operational demo next year you should be perfectly set seek an external sponsor. In the more immediate future, have you considered responding to the current NOPP call: <http://www.nopp.org/2017/fy-18-nopp-funding-announcement/> (see Topic 3)?

We also understand that the MEMS IMU you are considering incorporating is export restricted, so operating a CPF fitted with that sensor offshore will require an export permit (i.e., unless rules change). Are you aware of that potential complication?

We would like you to convene a readiness review ahead of the multi-CFP field demonstration, presumably after undertaking some/all of the optimization work needed to prepare for that operation.

Do you require dedicated Wave Glider time in 2018? The use of the Wave Glider is mentioned, but no time was requested.

Continue to develop plans for technology transfer (e.g., is CPF of commercial interest to SeaBird?); keep us informed of your progress.

For Phase 2 please address the following:

- Re-cast the project plan with the objective of demonstrating an operational array of the 3 existing CPFs.
- Request dedicated Wave Glider time if that is required.
- Delete the expense request for a 4th CPF; we do not have the funds for this at this time (and it is not clear that funds for 2 CPFs will be available in 2019, hence the request you seek external support for that in the context of a field experiment).
- Adjust labor requests to reflect the revised project plan.
- Eric Martin is oversubscribed. Please reduce the request for his time from 450 hours to 375 hours.