National Estuarine Research Reserve System Science Collaborative

2023 Request for Catalyst / Science Transfer Proposals Q&A Record

Last updated: November 23 , 2022

Topics Covered

Eligibility

Q: Is funding restricted to work performed on reserves?
A: NERRS Science Collaborative projects are not required to be located within the physical boundaries of a National Estuarine Research Reserve, or necessarily within a reserve's watershed. However, projects must be directly related to at least one reserve, address at least one or more reserve management or science transfer need, and must have the full support of the relevant reserve manager(s).

Q: Are social science proposals eligible? What about proposals focused on socio-ecological topics?
A: Yes. Just make sure that the work is directly responsive to a management or science transfer need articulated by a reserve.

Q: Can Science Collaborative project funds be used to support federal employees and/or their travel?
A: NERRS Science Collaborative funds may **not** be used to support salary or travel for federal employees; however, federal employees may participate as unfunded project team members.

Q: Are for-profit entities eligible recipients for Science Collaborative funding? Can they serve as the fiduciary institution?
A: Yes, private and for-profit firms are eligible recipients for Science Collaborative funding, so long as they are working in partnership with one or more reserves as described in the RFP. They may serve as the fiduciary institution.

Q: Can international collaborators participate as contractors?
A: Yes. Researchers from institutions outside the U.S. may be included on the project but cannot serve as the fiscal agent. Foreign researchers may also be funded by subawards through an eligible U.S. entity.

Q: Can one person be a team member on multiple proposals, for example working to address separate management and/or science transfer needs of different NERR sites?
A: Yes. There is no restriction on how many proposals one person can be a part of.

Reserve Engagement

Q: Can a need that has been identified *after* the annual reserve needs document was prepared be addressed under this RFP?
A: Yes but it will require some explanation in your proposal and a reserve letter of support. More specifically, make sure that your process for identifying the need is clearly articulated in the proposal narrative and confirmed by the relevant reserves through a letter of support. If you are a non-reserve applicant, this process would need to happen in close partnership with a reserve.

Q: Is it appropriate for reserve staff themselves to be users? Can reserve staff be users and also lead the project?
A: Yes to both. If reserve staff and/or programs are in a position to use the results or products and benefit from the project, they are likely a user. The proposal should explain how the project will enhance the work of the users. In some instances, a proposal is led by a reserve that is also a user, and that is ok.

Q: If I am working with a reserve research coordinator to develop a proposal, is this sufficient for the reserve engagement requirement, or should I also reach out to the reserve manager directly?
A: As the applicant, it is your job to ensure that the relevant manager(s) are fully aware of and sufficiently engaged in your proposal as it is developed. It is always helpful to double check that the research coordinator has connected with the manager about the proposed work and received any input they may have. This will help ensure everyone is on the same page, particularly around reserve staff contributions to the project.

Q: Is it acceptable to ask reserve managers for the use of reserve equipment and/or personnel time?
A: You should feel free to reach out to reserve managers with these types of questions; however, it is up to them to decide how to respond. Capacity and ability to accommodate these kinds of requests will vary from reserve to reserve.

Q: Are there added roles and responsibilities assigned to the "lead reserve"?
A: The lead reserve is the reserve most engaged in project planning and execution. If a proposal is led by a non-reserve entity, the lead reserve may serve as an additional point of contact for reserve and NOAA partners. Beyond this, there are no predetermined roles or responsibilities for the lead reserve.

Q: If an application lists multiple reserves, will it be viewed more favorably than an application that lists one or two reserves? Or is the level of engagement with those reserves more important?
A: The quality of the work and level of engagement are key to a successful project. Proposals should focus on developing and articulating the most appropriate approach for the project and end users. The number of reserves that are engaged and the extent to which they are engaged should be dictated by the goals and approach of the project. Each proposal will be reviewed according to what it is attempting to achieve. Within the proposal review process, there is no advantage or "extra credit" given to multi-reserve projects.

Collaboration and End User Engagement

Q: Are the National Estuarine Research Reserves themselves appropriate users?
Q: If our reserve is involved as a collaborator and lead reserve, are we also a user?
A: Reserve staff have played a variety of roles in Science Collaborative projects, including serving as project, technical, and collaborative lead, providing critical contributions to the technical work, and participating as an end user and project advisor.

Roles should match the expertise and interests of the individuals involved and the scope of a particular project, and be clearly explained in the proposal.

All Science Collaborative projects must address a reserve management or science transfer need and it's appropriate to consider the relevant reserve(s) to be an end user for a project, even for projects led by reserve staff and engaging additional end user groups. Applicants should consider which staff and which reserve programs are in a position to use the results/products and benefit from the project, and proposals should explain how the project will enhance the work of end users, including reserve staff.

As outlined in the RFP, end users are defined as individuals or groups in a position to apply the information or tools being produced, evaluated, or transferred through a Science Collaborative project in a way that is of direct consequence to the ecological, social, or economic integrity of a reserve(s) and/or surrounding watershed(s). Examples of users include, but are not limited to, reserve staff, and public, private, or non-governmental decision/policymakers, including Tribal Nations and Indigenous communities, landowners, regulators, resource managers, land use planners, leaders of impacted communities, and educators at all levels.

Q: Can NOAA be a user?
A: Yes, NOAA may be an end user if they will use the results to benefit their work.

Q: Are users required to be team members?
A: No. User representatives can be incorporated into the project team if they will be contributing significant time, expertise, or other resources to project activities. You are not required to include users in your project team.

Q: We have a long list of users. Do you have suggestions for how we might go about identifying a smaller group of primary end users?
A: There are a few resources on the Science Collaborative funding page that should help in identifying primary end users. See the "Understanding user needs" and "Reflections on engaging end users" resources on the applicant resources page.

Q: Do you have any tips for making a one-year project manageable, especially the collaborative elements?
A: The relatively short time frame of these one-year grants will require an efficient, targeted process for engaging users. For example, you might find that close collaboration with a single, highly relevant user group may be sufficient to develop a strong proposal. Or it may be appropriate to identify and engage individual users as representatives of critical groups, rather than designing a process that engages all potential users. Keep in mind that the goals and type of proposed work should dictate the engagement approach as well as the breadth and depth of engagement planned during the project.
The Science Collaborative has developed the Guide to Collaborative Science, which has resources to help you design your engagement process, including key considerations for engaging users effectively and efficiently.

Letters of Support

Q: Do we need a letter of support from a reserve to be eligible or competitive?
A: You need at least one letter of support from a primary user. If a reserve is a primary user, then a letter of support from the reserve is a great addition to the proposal.
A letter of support from a reserve is required if the proposal is designed to meet a reserve need that was not included in this year's reserve needs document. If your proposal is addressing an emergent need, reviewers require that letter to confirm that it is indeed a reserve need.

Q: If a reserve signs a letter of support, are they then not eligible to be a participating reserve in the project?
A: Signing a letter of support does not preclude a reserve from being a project partner; if a reserve is listed on the title page and also a user, then it makes complete sense for them to provide a letter of support, if they feel so inclined.

Q: Is there a limit to the number of letters of support we can include in our proposal?
A: No, there is no limit to the number of letters of support you may include in your proposal but you must include at least one letter from a primary user. Reviewers do need to make it through all of them, so please be thoughtful about how these letters are packaged.

Q: Are group letters of support ok?
A: Group letters can be helpful but be sure that the voice of every partner signing the letter comes through very clearly and with specificity,, e.g., share their specific examples of use/interest. Even in a group letter, the more specificity, the better.

Q: Who should letters of support be addressed to?
A: Letters of support should be addressed to the project lead or "Members of the Review Panel".

Q: If a user is also contributing a letter of support for another proposal in this competition, does that mean they have a conflict of interest and cannot submit one for my proposal?
A: From our perspective, that does not constitute a conflict of interest. A user could certainly be interested and benefit from more than one project, and is free to submit a letter of support for more than one proposal. However, it is important to make surethat, if both proposals happen to be funded, that they can commit whatever time they need to be engaged in the project.

Project Roles

Q: Can you provide more information on the collaborative lead? Is this someone separate from the project lead?
A: Project teams should include a collaborative lead who has the appropriate skills and experience to lead the collaborative process. The collaborative lead is responsible for the full engagement of users by helping to develop and manage a process that ensures

iteration with them, including mechanisms for being adaptive and responsive to their input. The proposal should clearly demonstrate that the collaborative lead has the skills to facilitate the collaborative aspects of the project. This person may also play a technical or other role on the team, if appropriate. The collaborative lead may, but does not have to be, the project lead.

Q: Can a reserve manager serve as the project lead?
A: Yes, reserve managers may serve as project lead, or play any other role on a project team if it is appropriate for the proposed work.

Q: Can there be more than one technical lead?
A: We suggest limiting the number of "leads" on a proposal to project lead, technical lead, and collaborative lead, but you can have as many other co-investigators or team members as you would like, with roles that you might define yourself. Part of the technical lead role is to oversee and help coordinate and integrate the technical elements, which is probably best done by a single individual.

Q: Is it common to have one person be the project, fiscal, and the technical lead?
A: In most cases, the project lead is also the fiscal lead. However, recognizing that reserves sometimes work with Friends Groups who serve as fiduciary organizations, there may be instances where the project lead is not employed by the institution that will receive and manage the grant. In these cases, a project team member from the fiduciary institution must serve as lead. The contract will be issued to the fiduciary organization under the responsibility/authority of this individual and they will have ultimate responsibility of ensuring that the proposed scope of work is completed.

Some projects do list the same person as project lead and technical lead. Just be sure to explain who will help manage the overall project process. For example, different project management tasks might fall to the project lead, collaborative lead, or another designated project manager, and some brief explanation of this is helpful so reviewers understand how the team will ensure good management and completion of the proposed work.

Review & Selection Process

Q: On page 33 of the RFP it says, "No reserve will serve as the lead reserve on more than one catalyst or science transfer project, except in cases where a reserve is leading a project that involves three or more reserves." Does this mean a reserve can only support one single -reserve proposal submission?
A: A reserve may lead and submit multiple proposals to this opportunity but it is unlikely that a single reserve will be funded to lead multiple projects, except in cases where the additional projects engage three or more reserves. In other words, a reserve may be the lead reserve on more than one catalyst/science transfer award this year if the additional projects involve three or more reserves. This secondary selection factor allows the Science Collaborative, in consultation with the NOAA Program Manager, to make small deviations for the rank ordering of proposals provided by the review panel to ensure that

a single reserve is not the lead reserve for more than one award through this funding opportunity, with an exception for proposals involving three or more reserves.

Q: Will the Science Collaborative be looking to the reserves to indicate their preference if there are multiple proposals involving their reserves?
A: All proposals will be reviewed independently; panelists will not consider secondary selection factors (such as distribution of funds across regions or reserves) in their review and ranking process. While we do not expect reserves to choose one proposal over the other, managers can provide a letter of support to be included as an appendix to the proposal or share any concerns directly with the Science Collaborative via a proposal assessment form.

Q: Is there any advantage or disadvantage to reserves that have/had previous Science Collaborative projects?
A: There is no advantage or disadvantage to reserves that have had previous projects. Each proposal is reviewed for its own internal logic.

Q: Is it better to have a user submit the proposal, rather than the institution or reserve?
A: Not necessarily. The applicant should be the project lead and the person best suited to serve that role for the project, regardless of where they sit. The project lead is the primary contact for the project, coordinates the project team, and ensures all elements of the project are implemented. In most cases, the project lead is also the fiscal lead. As far as the review panel is concerned, they will want to see that the individual leading the project is the right person for the role. In some cases, that individual may be an end user and/or a reserve staff member but that is not a requirement or expectation.

Proposal Format and Appendices

Q: Does the order of the subheadings in the project narrative of my proposal have to be the same as in the RFP guidelines?
A: Yes, applicants should follow the order of the headings in the proposal narrative. Within each section, applicants can sequence content as they choose.

Q: Can we have a table or a conceptual figure in the project narrative?
A: Yes, figures and tables may be included within the narrative so long as the 10-page limit is not exceeded. These are usually somewhat situational depending on the proposal. If including a figure or table is important to convey a message you can, and should feel free, to include them but it is not necessary for the success of a proposal.

Q: Other than a limit of two pages, is there a particular format or style you would like to see in the resumes of team members? For example, should we aim for a more formal academic style (with lists of publications) or are you looking for a more condensed display of project summaries (perhaps those that highlight examples of collaborative work)?

A: We do not specify a format for the resumes, other than to limit them to two pages. You are welcome to use whatever style you think best conveys the person's expertise that is most relevant to the proposal and their specific role in the project. You are also welcome to use different formats for different types of team members.

Q: Are we required to include the resumes of end users in Appendix G?
A: Resumes are required for team members listed on the proposal title page. Resumes will be used by reviewers to determine whether the team has the requisite technical and collaborative skills and experience to undertake the project successfully. If users are on your team and will be contributing to the work, you should include their resumes.

Q: Do we need resumes from each team member listed, or just the leads?
A: Resumes should be included for all the team members listed on the proposal title page, but not necessarily "advisors".

Q: What types of materials can be included in "Appendix I: Other Supporting Documents"?
A: Applicants may include up to five pages of documents in support of the project. This may include figures, maps, diagrams, references, or other relevant items that help to clarify and/or demonstrate the value of the proposed work.

Budget

Q: What are the requirements for Science Collaborative projects regarding indirect cost rates?
A: The Science Collaborative recognizes federally negotiated indirect cost rates. Lower indirect cost rates are acceptable, if the proposing organization or institution approves it. If the fiduciary institution does not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate, they may apply a "de minimis" rate of up to 10%. Please note that for any subcontracts, unless otherwise noted in the indirect cost rate agreement, indirect costs may only be applied to the first $25,000 of each subcontract.

Q: How will budgets be handled for multi-institutional teams?
A: The University of Michigan will subcontract to the lead fiduciary institution which will then subcontract to all partners. A detailed budget and justification is required for the lead institution and each subcontractor.

Q: Is there a cost match requirement on any of the collaborative research projects?
A: We do not require matching funds for any Science Collaborative opportunities.

Q: Do you encourage in-kind matching funds from outside of the reserves?
A: This is not a requirement but is one way to demonstrate commitment and engagement from your partners.

Q: Would it be a disadvantage to submit a proposal with a relatively smaller budget compared to the maximum?

A: No, proposals should have appropriate budgets for the proposed work.

Q: How much of the budget should be dedicated to data management? Should it account for time or other components such as software?
A: Our rough rule of thumb is that you should assume that 10 -15 % of your overall budget should be dedicated to data management and data sharing activities. This portion of the budget should focus on everything you need to meet data sharing and archiving requirements, e.g., personnel time for cleaning up and preparing data and metadata for archival, software licenses, etc.

Q: Are there any items that are not allowable in the budget; for example gift cards to stakeholders who may be missing a day of work to help with the pr oject?
A: There are some particular guidelines for the budget, in particular around purchasing large pieces of equipment. Gift cards are not permitted. Honoraria or travel reimbursements to encourage user participation are examples of allowable costs, you just need to clearly articulate the purpose and justify the amount in the budget.

Q: Is there a preferred category for participant support costs or support to attend workshops in the budget template?
A: Those can go as a separate line under "participant support," "travel support," or can be classified as "other."

Q: I am developing a proposal that includes several reserves and a couple of other subcontracts, which has implications for administering and indirect costs. Is there an alternate way for the Sci ence Collaborative to administer funds to multiple reserves on a project like this or is it best to plan this as a single award to one fiscal agent with subcontracts below that?
A: Please plan the budget as a single award to one fiscal agent with subcontracts below that. In the past, project teams have also used honoraria to easily provide resources to many participating reserves, versus via subcontract.

Q: I would like to offer staff at many different reserves who are engaged in the project and experts/advisors to the project the ability to invoice to cover the cost of their time (roughly $2k -5k apiece). Do I need to present these as individual contracts and include fiscal letters of commitment or is there a simpler way?
A: You could go the route of subcontracts or maybe think about these expenses as honoraria that you set a maximum amount for and account for as separate lines in your budget. You need to provide an explanation for them in your justification but can avoid drawing up lots of subcontracts and letters of fiscal commitment.

Alternatively, depending on the fiduciary's rules, a partner institution may invoice (vs subcontract) small amounts for reserve staff time. For example, a fiduciary may have a rule that allows them to reimburse up to 10K without a subcontract. Typically an honorarium is to compensate an individual for work outside their regular work, so the language might affect your approach.

Q: Is graduate student tuition an eligible expense?
A: Yes, projects that include graduate student support may include tuition for these students in the budget.

Q: Are expenses associated with infrastructure eligible expenses?
A: No, infrastructure is not supportable with the type of funds we have for this grant program.

Other

Q: Do you require that an Authorized Organizational Representative submit the Letters of Intent , or will you accept LOI's submitted directly by project leads ?
A: Our system requires a unique account and login to submit a LOI. One individual/user account can submit more than one application, and on behalf of multiple project leads, but it is a little cleaner on our end if the project lead simply creates the account and submits the LOI and later the proposal. The same login credentials used to submit the LOI should be used to submit the proposal. You can submit the LOIs on behalf of all project leads at your institution, but please feel free to encourage them to do so and keep track of their login credentials.

Q: Is there a repository of previous successful catalyst and science transfer projects?
A: The Science Collaborative project catalog allows you to select "catalyst" and “science transfer” projects to get a full list of current and prior projects.

Q: Do you have any tips about team management or proposal s that set themselves up for successful project management?
A: Previous teams have been successful with charters as a way to clarify roles and responsibilities early on, along with expectations and accountability. Here's an example of a charter a team prepared for working with their advisory committee. Charters can also be developed for project teams.

Data Management and CDMO Services

Q: Is using the NERRS Centralized Data Management Office (CDMO) for data archival the preferred approach?
A: We don’t have a preference for data archival, it just needs to be logical and accessible to the maximum number of people. It might be helpful to see where similar types of data, such as genetic data or remote sensing data, are already archived and accessible.

Q: Does using CDMO for data archival and management need to be budgeted for?
A: Data archival services are provided as part of CDMO core requirements and do not need to be part of a project’s budget. If a project has more involved data management or archival needs, CDMO can work with project leads to evaluate whether there needs to be an associated cost; those conversations should take place as early as possible with those submitting proposals.

Q: Is there a maximum size limit on data that can be arch ived on CDMO?

A: CDMO has not yet encountered any data collections that they cannot archive. If this changes at a later date, CDMO will evaluate each situation on a case-by-case basis.

Q: Who should we contact with data management questions?
A: All questions regarding the full proposal guidelines and development, including data management, should be sent to nerrs-info@umich.edu. The Science Collaborative will coordinate responses with other team members, including CDMO.

Q: What services are the CDMO able to provide for funded NSC projects? What services will the CDMO NOT provide?
A: The CDMO can host data and associated metadata for funded NSC projects that need such a service. The CDMO can also provide web services for projects that need to provide data pushing or pulling services. Individual projects are responsible for expenses and activities associated with data collection, QA/QC and metadata development, though the CDMO can provide some guidance in these areas if needed. Please note that the CDMO can only provide web-based data archiving and access services; the CDMO will NOT provide for the development and maintenance of websites for individual projects.

Q: If we plan to use the CDMO to host our data, do we need to get permission or some sort of agreement to include in the proposal?
A: CDMO is committed to helping all recipients of Science Collaborative grants in a few ways, including consulting on data sharing plans and processes, and archiving and making accessible project datasets using their servers and typical protocols. If CDMO's standard archival/access process, as explained below, meets your project needs, applicants are welcome to include that approach in their proposal's data sharing plans without a detailed conversation with CDMO.

The Science Collaborative can provide the following access and archival process for any project teams that wish to archive data with CDMO: We will create an entry about your datasets in the Science Collaborative online library, as well as in national data catalogs (InPort), and potential users will have an option to complete a data request form. The form will generate an email response with a data download link connecting the user to the package of data and metadata files that have been archived with the CDMO. More complicated data sharing ideas, such as developing an interactive user interface for a database, would require some extra conversations with CDMO and likely additional resources, as this is not part of CDMO's typical support for Science Collaborative projects. You are welcome to reach out to Dwayne Porter from the CDMO (porter@sc.edu) to discuss more involved data management needs.

Data Management for Unique T ypes of Data

Q: If part of the project is to develop and improve code, are there special places to share it? Special requirements?
A: CDMO can provide access to code directly, but also considers GitHub a legitimate and effective way of sharing statistical and modeling code.

Q: For projects that are collecting very large data sets, e.g., imagery, can the team submit the metadata to the CDMO or other NOAA repository but store or archive the raw data using a proposing team member's institutional resources?
A: Yes, this is an appropriate strategy; NOAA's repositories may be able to accommodate such large data sets for archival purposes, but timely access of stored data can be an issue. The proposing team should describe this process in their Data Sharing Plan and provide links to any existing websites that will be used to make data accessible.

Q: What is the definition of "derived data"?
A: The NOAA/NERRS Science Collaborative requirements for data sharing are in effect for new data collected as part of a NSC-funded activity and for derived data created as part of such activity. "Derived data" refers to information derived from existing data resources and/or new data that you have collected. As an example, a project focusing on coastal resiliency may collect data on the environmental, social, infrastructural and policy characteristics of communities in support of developing a coastal resiliency index for each community. The determined resiliency index for each community would be considered derived data.

Q. For projects that propose running models, how should the storage and availability of model outputs be addressed?
A: Archival and access to model outputs can present the same challenges as with imagery described above. Project teams should develop an appropriate strategy for both archival and access of model outputs.

Q: Is there a standard for social science data, similar to the standards for environmental data?
A: No, there is no standard for social science data, as the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process for human subject research varies from institution to institution. In general, social science data collected as part of a research project that had to go through IRB approval is also subject to federal data sharing rules. Research studies involving human subjects require IRB review. Evaluative studies, such as needs assessments, user experience surveys and program/tool evaluation activities typically do not require IRB approval, unless the activity is being conducted to answer a broader research question. However, it is not always easy to distinguish between these two types of projects and many projects frequently have elements of both.

Human subjects are defined as "living individual(s) about whom an investigator conducting research obtains (1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual; or (2) identifiable private information." Research involving the secondary analysis of existing data must be also reviewed by the IRB to ensure that the original data was properly and ethically obtained and that the objectives of the secondary analysis are aligned with those for which consent was obtained. All human subject research, as explained above, regardless of whether or not identifying information is collected must be reviewed by the IRB. The research, including the recruitment of research participants, cannot begin until the application has been reviewed and approved. Therefore, the decision about whether review is required should be made in concert with the IRB.

Proposing teams should identify and comply with the IRB process that is appropriate for their project team. If you have any questions about whether this applies to your project, please contact us (nerrs-info@umich.edu).

Q: What is considered data? For example, are interviews or evidence libraries considered data?
A: Survey responses collected as part of a research are typically considered data in the eyes of NOAA and the Federal Government. Evidence libraries would require further discussion to determine whether they meet requirements.

Q: If we are collecting data with an existing DSP under CDMO, such as SWMP data, as well as new, original data, how should we articulate this in our data sharing plan?
A: It is important to be as detailed as possible on what data are being collected, where they will be stored, and how they can be accessed. In the case above, it is important to detail what data being collected are SWMP data and what are new, original data and how they will be managed. NERRS CDMO wants to know where data management responsibilities lie and where the data resides in case authorized individuals are interested in seeing portions of the data collected.

General Data Sharing Expectations

Q: What is the time frame for data sharing? Do data need to be shared by the end of the grant timeline?
A: The expectation is that data will be made available as quickly as possible. For some projects this could be throughout the life of the project, for others it could be at the end of the project or within 2 years of the end date. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) requires that environmental data collected and/or created under NOAA grants and cooperative agreements must be made visible, accessible, and independently understandable to general users, free of charge or at minimal cost, in a timely manner, typically no later than two (2) years after the data are collected or created, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or security requirements. If a team is not ready to make their data publically accessible at project closeout, they must provide a copy of their datasets and metadata for interim archival with the Science Collaborative.

Q: How should projects address long-term accessibility and usability of project data sets, results, models or other tools?
A: Ideally, the project team should engage intended users from the beginning and work together to develop a plan for making data, results and tools accessible and usable for end users during and after the project period. Intended users will have different needs, capabilities and expectations for how they might access and use project outputs. Storing project datasets in established data repositories (e.g., CDMO, NODC) is important, but additional steps may need to be taken to ensure that intended users are able to find and apply project results.

Q: Does including collected data in a table or as an appendix of a published manuscript or technical report suffice for meeting the requirements for data sharing?

A: Sharing data is defined as making data visible, accessible, and independently understandable to users in a timely manner at minimal cost to users, except where limited by law, regulation, policy or by security requirements. While including collected data in a table or as an appendix in a published manuscript or technical report is encouraged, that alone does not meet the NOAA requirements for data sharing. It is expected that each project collecting new data will make the actual QA/QC'd data and associated metadata available and archived via a web portal or data repository maintained by the project investigators, project partners, a NOAA-approved data warehouse, or the CDMO.

Q: If our project is collecting new data to augment or integrate into an already existing dataset, do we also need to make available the previously collected data?
A: No; the requirement to archive and share data applies only to data collected with Science Collaborative funding.