Contents

Eligibility 1
New Faculty Members and Those without Current HEP Grants 1
For PIs with Existing HEP Grants 2
Proposal 3
Budget 5
Review Process 5

Eligibility

Q: Who is eligible to apply to this program?
A: All types of applicants are eligible to apply except other Federal agencies, Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) Contractors, and non-profit organizations described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that engaged in lobbying activities after December 31, 1995.

New Faculty Members and Those without Current HEP Grants

Q: I am a new tenure-track faculty member at my institution, which is submitting a renewal proposal this year, and I am also applying to the Office of Science Early Career Research program. Should I include a copy of my Early Career proposal as part of my institution's renewal proposal for FY2013?
A: You cannot submit the *same* proposal to two different Office of Science solicitations at the same time. If you submit the same proposal as part of your institution's comparative review proposal, that part of the overall proposal will be administratively declined and not considered further. If you choose to submit a proposal with your institution it must have different research scope than your Early Career proposal. The DOE manager for your grant will make the determination whether two concurrent proposals from the same (co)PI have sufficient differences to be separately considered for review.

Q: I am a new tenure-track faculty member at my institution, which is submitting a continuation progress report this year, and I am also applying to the Office of Science Early Career Research program. Should I submit a copy of my Early Career proposal as a stand-alone new proposal to the comparative review FOA?
A: You cannot submit the same proposal to two different solicitations for the reasons noted above. If you wish to submit a second proposal in addition to the Early Career, it should be for different research scope. You are strongly encouraged to submit a (non-Early Career) proposal to

the comparative review FOA. New or renewal proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be reviewed following standard merit review criteria (see *Review Process*); however, funding available to respond to proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be extremely limited.

Q: I will be a new assistant professor, starting my first faculty position on September 1, 2013. Can I apply to the comparative review FOA?
A: While you may apply, be advised that evidence of research productivity while holding your faculty position is considered highly desirable. Proposals from first year junior faculty lacking such evidence will likely be assigned a lower funding priority.

Q: I applied to a previous call for HEP comparative review proposals but my proposal was declined. Can I apply again to this funding opportunity?
A: Yes.

For PIs with Existing HEP Grants

Q: I have an existing HEP grant which expires before September 30, 2013. If I want to renew that grant how do I apply?
A: If your grant expires on or after April 1, 2013, you are strongly encouraged not to submit a renewal proposal and only submit a new proposal under the new comparative review FOA. If your grant expires before April 1, 2013, you may submit a renewal proposal to the general SC solicitation [DE-FOA-0000600 *et seq.*], at least 6 months before the project end date for your existing grant. Our intention is to renew existing grants only for a limited term (< 1 year) while we conduct the comparative reviews under the new FOA [DE-FOA-0000733]. *After the limited term expires, these existing grants will not be renewed.*

Q: My current grant expires after April 1, 2013, so I would normally submit my renewal proposal after the new proposals are due. Should I submit a new proposal to the new FOA or a renewal proposal to the general solicitation?
A: We strongly encourage you to submit a new proposal to the new FOA. New or renewal proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be reviewed following standard merit review criteria (see *Review Process*); however, funding available to respond to proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be extremely limited.

Q: If my existing HEP grant is only renewed for a short term, how do I ensure funding for future years?
A: You will also need to submit a new proposal to the comparative review FOA [DE-FOA-0000733]. Grants funded under this solicitation will generally be multi-year awards.

Q: What is the difference between a renewal proposal submitted to the general SC solicitation and new proposal submitted to the HEP comparative review FOA?
A: The technical content of either proposal should be essentially the same, if you are proposing the same scope of research. However there are important formatting differences for the HEP comparative review proposals, including hard page limits, separating the descriptions of research

tasks by subprogram, and accompanying budget documents. Details can be found in the comparative review FOA.

Q: If I have an existing HEP grant which expires after September 30, 2013, do I need to apply?
A: Not this year. If your grant expires in FY2014 (Oct. 1, 2013 – Sept. 30, 2014) you are urged to apply, next year, under the new FOA before the anticipated September 9, 2013 deadline (exact deadline to be determined). Depending on the expiration date of your current grant, you may also need to submit a renewal proposal to cover the period between your current grant expiration and April 1, 2013.

Proposal

Q: Is a letter of intent required?
A: No. Letters of Intent are requested to organize and expedite the merit review process. Consequently, the submission of a LOI is strongly encouraged but not required.

Q: Are pre-applications requested?
A: No.

Q: What kinds of proposals are you looking for?
A: We are soliciting new proposals for research in High Energy Physics (HEP). All applications must address at least one of the six HEP subprograms described in the Funding Opportunity Announcement. Proposals which are not consistent with the scope of the research described in the FOA may be administratively declined without review.

Q: How will you handle new proposals that are not for direct support of research, like conferences, experiment operations, computing support, etc?
A: All such applications must be submitted to the regular Office of Science open solicitation. The HEP comparative review FOA (DE-FOA-0000733) is for direct support of HEP research activities.

Q: In an application with multiple senior investigators, does the page limit apply to the narrative of each investigator or to the aggregate of all the narratives?
A: The page limit will be applied to the whole proposal based on the number of senior investigators. For example, if an application contains 4 senior investigators, the page limit for the application narrative would be 36. One of the senior investigators may exceed their allotted 9 pages as long as the total page count does not exceed 36.

Q: Are there limits on the length of the proposal?
A: Yes. The total length of the research description(s) must not exceed 9 pages per senior investigator. Other parts of the submission (cover page, budget pages, etc.) do NOT count against this limit; see full text of funding announcement for details. Additional supporting material (i.e. CVs, publication lists, etc.) should be put in a separate file which can be attached to

the application. *Proposals which exceed the page limit will NOT be reviewed and therefore cannot be considered for funding.*

Q: I am involved in two experiments. Is the page limit really 9 per senior investigator or 9 per senior investigator per experiment?
A: The page limit refers to the total number of pages per senior investigator, irrespective of the number of activities being described.

Q: I work in the CMS experiment and in the NOvA experiment. Do I have to split my 9 pages of research narrative into the Intensity and Energy Frontiers section of the proposal or can I have a single section describing all of my work?
A: Because each subprogram will be reviewed separately, senior investigators with effort in more than one subprogram must split their narratives according to subprogram and place them in the appropriate section in the application. Please note that the 9-page limit per senior investigator still applies.

Q: According to the instructions we are allowed six appendices. My institution is involved in several different efforts (ATLAS, Theory, SuperK). Do we get six appendices for each of these? Or do we break each appendix into sections for these different efforts?
A: No, the total number of appendices per proposal should not exceed six regardless of the number of efforts. Less than six are allowed but no more.

Q: The proposal needs to include a Project Summary/Abstract (Field 7 on the Form) which contains a summary of the proposed activity suitable for dissemination to the public. My grant is involved in several different efforts (ATLAS, Theory, SuperK). Do I submit a Project Summary/Abstract for each?
A: No, only one Project Summary/Abstract per proposal. The Project Summary/Abstract should summarize all efforts.

Q: What is the definition of "senior investigator"?
A: For the purposes of calculating the page limit, a senior investigator is considered to be an active tenured or tenure-track faculty member at the sponsoring institution. Research collaborators at other institutions are not included. Non-tenure-track faculty (e.g., research faculty) or senior research staffs with term appointments are not included *unless* they are the sole principal investigator on the proposal. However the roles and responsibilities of senior research faculty and/or research staff as part of the proposal should be clearly spelled out in the research description.

Q: Are there limits on the length of the project period for the proposed research?
A: No, but HEP research grants are typically awarded for a three-year period.

Q: When are new proposals due?
A: 11:59 PM ET on September 10, 2012.

Q: When are new awards issued under this FOA expected to start?
A: On or about April 1, 2013.

Q: I have already submitted a new proposal to the general solicitation [DE-FOA-0000600]. How should I proceed?
A: We strongly encourage you to withdraw your proposal and resubmit to the new FOA. New or renewal proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be reviewed following standard merit review criteria (see *Review Process*); however, funding available to respond to proposals submitted to the general solicitation will be extremely limited.

Budget

Q: Are there minimum or maximum limits on the budget that can be requested?
A: No.

Q: What is the typical size of an HEP research award?
A: There is a wide range of awards from $10,000 to over $1,000,000 per year. Usually the size of the award roughly scales with the number of senior investigators on a grant.

Q: What budget form(s) do I have to submit?
A: You need to submit the standard grants.gov budget sheets for the *entire* proposal (for each budget year, plus a cumulative budget page) following the standard procedure described on the grants.gov website. *In addition*, DOE budget sheets *must* be included for the proposed activities described in *each* subprogram section of the application. These should be inserted in the Other Attachments section of the application.

Q: Is cost-sharing required?
A: No.

Q: The funding opportunity announcement (FOA) says support and infrastructure provided by the sponsoring institution should be described in the proposal. Do I need a separate budget form and justification for this?
A. No. The support and infrastructure provided by the sponsoring institution (as appropriate) should be separately described in the research narrative but does NOT have a separate budget. Infrastructure and support activities should be reported on budget sheets as direct and/or indirect costs (whichever is customary at your institution) in each subprogram section of the proposal as noted above,

Review Process

Q: What are the criteria for acceptance of proposals?
A: All proposals must be responsive to one or more of the scientific research subprograms detailed in the Supplementary Information in the FOA. Proposals judged to be nonresponsive will be declined.

Q: Are there additional requirements?
A: Additional requirements for proposals are detailed under New Application Requirements in the FOA.

Q: What are the merit review criteria for the HEP comparative review FOA? [DE-FOA-0000733]?
A: The merit review criteria are the same as in the standard Office of Science Financial Assistance Program Rules detailed in 10 CFR 605.10.

Q: How will the merit reviews be conducted?
A: All proposals judged to be responsive to the FOA will be submitted to external experts for peer review. For the HEP comparative reviews, the six different subprograms outlined in the FOA will be reviewed by separate mail and/or panel reviews that will compare the relative strengths of the proposals in that subprogram. Reviewers will typically evaluate multiple proposals and will be asked to provide a written evaluation of these proposals. All proposals will be evaluated by at least three experts. For subprograms conducting panel reviews, the panel will consider all proposals in that subprogram and individual panel members will rank order these proposals in terms of overall merit.

Q: How will the reviews be used by the DOE?
A: DOE program managers will consider the written evaluations as well as the individual rankings of proposals as input to making final decisions on which proposals will be funded and at what level. Additional considerations such as programmatic priority, overall program balance and continuity may also factor into DOE decisions. Written reviewer evaluations will be returned to the applicant after redaction of information that could compromise reviewer confidentiality.

Q: How can I improve my chances of receiving funding?
A: Funding decisions are made on the basis of scientific peer review, alignment with HEP programmatic priorities, and the technical judgment and expertise of program managers. If you have peer reviews from previous proposals you are strongly encouraged to read those reviews carefully and to address the deficiencies identified by the reviewers. A critical assessment of draft versions of your current proposal by colleagues or collaborators may also be helpful in improving your proposal.