

# SEARCH YEAR 2 plan and review - bpkelly@alaska.edu

Inbox	x
-------	---

Yr2 plan	x
----------	---



**Swanberg, Neil R.**

Feb 16 (2 days ago)

to me, Caspar, Helen

Brendan, Caspar and Helen

I am sorry it has taken some time to get back to you on your Year Two plan. I now have feedback from the rest of the staff here and there is agreement that we can approve the plan, but that we first want an addition that will make it easier to deal with when we reach the evaluation of progress.

In the Year One report we received last summer there was a section that showed “Year One Milestones and Timeline.” This was a valuable aid to compare against the original plan and I believe it also helped you to keep track of progress. This helped to identify areas that need attention. In reading through the current plan, it seems some of the most important outcomes are in explanatory prose, complemented with lists or bullets of meetings and tasks. This gives the impression, and I believe it may be false, that the outcomes are going to be a series of meetings, white papers and press releases. I think that expanding those lists to something like that which appeared in the Year One report might be helpful. Also, questions from several suggested that the significant science gains from each task team and the SSC overall were not obvious to some readers. Perhaps highlighting these as anticipated major science progress for the year would help? I think it is all there, but think it could be presented better, perhaps with a clever table or something. As soon as that is addressed I can release the increment. It would be helpful to know where your elements are in their spending plan, but our intent is to make this the only FY 16 increment, then we can conduct the site visit during the summer or early fall and address the next increment in FY 17. Ultimately this may wind up extending the award by some months, which mostly tracks to the delay in spinning things up.

I have suggested this with Helen in our monthly call, and she seemed receptive to the idea. It would probably not take much more work. I also informed her that I have approved the release of the ARCUS

jacket because it was listed as just an appendix in the Year Two plan, so performance appeared not to be an issue.

In my latest email to you I expressed some confusion over the issues you raised about evaluation. I recall that SEARCH wanted to do an evaluation itself, of SEARCH, not of this project. I don't think we have much to say about how SEARCH conducts that, though we can give our thoughts if you want of course. Our evaluation of the progress under this award is a separate issue and will be accomplished by the process of reports and, at some points, site visits.

I hope all this meets with your agreement and that it can be completed without too much extra work.

Yours,

Neil

Dr. Neil Swanberg

Director, Arctic System Science Program

Division of Polar Programs, Geosciences Directorate

National Science Foundation

4201 Wilson Blvd.

Arlington, VA 22230 USA

e-mail: [nswanber@nsf.gov](mailto:nswanber@nsf.gov)