

DRAFT Science Funding Coordination Questionnaire

Introduction and Terminology:

A team of staff from Delta science funders (DWR, USBR, USGS, Delta Stewardship Council, CDFW, State Water Contractors) has been engaged in conversations about enhancing funding coordination across funding entities. We would like to expand the discussion to a larger group of agencies to determine what level of enhanced coordination would be mutually beneficial. To kick off this conversation, please fill out this questionnaire.

We have discussed the following types of enhanced science funding coordination, and we will use the terms below in the questionnaire:

- **Coordinated funding body (CFB):** An interagency group of staff from science funders that meets regularly to ensure mutual awareness of upcoming solicitations to avoid competing solicitations and identify opportunities for joint solicitations or partnerships for proposal review and/or administration.
- **Common pre-proposal process:** A “one-door” approach for scientists to access funding opportunities. PIs with ideas that advance the Science Action Agenda, Prop 1 priorities, Sacramento River Partnership priorities, and/or other priorities listed on a common website would submit short (e.g., 2-page) pre-proposals to the CFB on a rolling basis. The CFB would meet sub-annually to review pre-proposals. PIs with appealing project ideas would be directed to the most appropriate solicitation/agency, provided with feedback to ensure optimal alignment of their proposal with the management need, and invited to submit full proposals.

Questions:

1. Would your agency be interested in exploring opportunities for funding coordination with other agencies? (Yes/No. If no, exit the questionnaire.)
2. What **minimum geographic scope** would make the investment in funding coordination worthwhile for your agency (i.e., if the geographic scope was smaller, you would not be interested in investing in greater coordination)?
 - a. Delta
 - b. Central Valley
 - c. San Francisco Estuary
 - d. Other (write in)

3. What would be your agency's **preferred geographic scope** for investing in funding coordination?
 - a. Delta
 - b. Central Valley
 - c. San Francisco Estuary
 - d. Other (write in)

4. Would you be interested in having a representative from your agency participate in a Coordinated Funding Body, if the geographic scope were acceptable (see description above)? (Yes, possibly, no)

5. Would you be interested in your agency participating in a common pre-proposal process, if the geographic scope were acceptable? (Yes, possibly, no)

6. If you are potentially interested in participating in a common pre-proposal process, would your agency prefer to use this process to encourage project proposals for:
 - a. Competitive solicitations only
 - b. Competitive solicitations and directed actions (e.g., noncompetitive projects)
 - c. Directed actions only
 - d. Other (write in)

7. Would you be most interested in greater coordination on:
 - a. Research funding
 - b. Implementation funding
 - c. Both research and implementation funding

8. At what frequency would you prefer to see a Coordinated Funding Body meet (select one or more, if multiple options are acceptable and worthy of consideration)?
 - a. 1x/yr
 - b. 2x/yr
 - c. 3x/yr
 - d. 4x/yr
 - e. Other

9. Would you be interested in exploring opportunities for joint administration of review panels? (Yes, possibly, no)

10. Would you be interested in exploring opportunities for joint post-award administration (e.g., through California Sea Grant)? (Yes, possibly, no)