

Answers to general and policy  
questions relative to  
the CV2015 Call

# Proposal format and structure

- ◆ 36 pages of proposal, plus optional cover page (graphics, title, authors)
- ◆ Everything must fit in 36 pages!
  - ◆ Tables, figures, bibliography, addenda, etc.
- ◆ PDF format, min. 11 points font, single spaced
- ◆ 36 Mbyte maximum files size!

# Proposal format and structure

- ◆ Pages in excess of 36 will be discarded and not submitted to reviewers
- ◆ Proposal must be self-sufficient
- ◆ Letters of commitment from partner agencies do not count against the 36 pages limit
- ◆ They must however be included with the submission

# Proposal format and structure

- ◆ Proposal structure described in AO is only indicative, you can deviate from it if you so wish
- ◆ Lists of CoIs are desirable, however amount of information is up to proposer (this counts against the 36 pages)
- ◆ Proposed procurement scheme (and potential funders, agencies, laboratories, etc.) for all P/L elements should be indicated

# Proposal format and structure

- ◆ All material in the proposal must be considered as public
- ◆ No confidential information (e.g. industrial) can be dealt with at this stage
- ◆ For proposals entering study phase appropriate arrangements will be taken to handle confidential information

# Letters of commitment

- ◆ Letters of commitment are requested from *all* international partner agencies from which a significant contribution is foreseen
  - ◆ P/L elements, launcher, ops, etc.
  - ◆ To be provided from “international” partners (e.g. NASA, JAXA/ISAS, Russia, Canada, ISRO, China, etc.)
    - ◆ Letter must come from national agency, not from scientific institution, Academy of Sciences, etc.
  - ◆ ESA Member State agencies must be provided with copy of proposal

# Letters of commitment

- ◆ Proposals in which the involvement from scientists funded from partner agencies is purely at the scientific level (i.e. with no provision of mission elements with a significant impact on the mission's Cost at Completion) do not need to be accompanied by letters of commitments.

# Letters of commitment

- ◆ Letters must state intention of partner agency to support the initial assessment study phase in case the proposals are selected.
- ◆ No commitment for the following phase is expected at this stage.
- ◆ ESA will immediately undertake discussions with the partner agencies to determine the level of interest and potential involvement for the following phases.



# Letters of commitment

- ◆ All international partners have been made formally aware of the existence of the Cosmic Vision Call for new missions, and of the expected level of commitment expected for collaborative proposals.

# Letters of commitment

- ◆ Both NASA and the Canadian Space Agency have started national competitive processes to decide which CV2015 proposals to support
- ◆ The process has been mutually agreed and therefore the resulting letter of commitment (in NASA's case this has been dubbed a "letter of acknowledgement") is sufficient at this stage.

# Letters of commitment

- ◆ During the selection phase ESA will conduct preliminary negotiations with the proposed partner agencies to determine how the proposals fit within the partner's priorities, and feed this information back into the evaluation process.
- ◆ The potential level of commitment from the proposed partner will be evaluated

# General questions

- ◆ Will ESA make available some funds for the studies? **Not to proposers.**
- ◆ What level of effort will be required from proposers after the proposal has been submitted? **None unless proposals is selected for a study**

# General questions

- ◆ Are there any recommendations on how negotiations with industry on proposal preparation should be carried out? **Not from ESA's side.**
- ◆ For proposals to provide P/L to missions from other partners, should the descriptions of the "main" mission be dealt with in summary form in the proposal and that greater emphasis be placed on ESA contributions? **Your choice where to put the emphasis.**

# General questions

- ◆ Is there any forum for answering questions about the preparation of the proposals after the meeting of 11 April?  
Yes, you can email questions until end of April and they will be answered on a web site ([sci.esa.int](http://sci.esa.int)). The Q&As will be visible to everybody by the end of May.

# General questions

- ◆ Are there any special provisions for missions calling for ESA contributions much less than the 300 MEuro M Class cost cap ("small missions")? **No special provisions, they will be treated like M missions.**

# General questions

- ◆ Can a proposal contain de/upscoping options thus presenting not a fixed scheme but rather a spectrum of possibilities one of which will be selected during the Assessment Study phase? **Up to you what to include, descoping options, etc.**



# General questions

- ◆ Must elements provided by international partners be described in as much details as Europe-provided elements?  
The detail must be sufficient to allow the assessment of the proposal from both the technical and the scientific point of view. A model P/L and science return is an essential element of this.

# General questions

- ◆ Are international collaborations encouraged or discouraged? They are neither encouraged nor discouraged. ESA has a long history of successful international partnerships, so they do not constitute an obstacle. Partnerships should obviously bring added value.

# General questions

- ◆ Can mission operations be separate from ESOC (through an open AO process)? **Not in general, although ops could be provided by international partner.**
- ◆ Can science operations be separate from those offered by ESA (through an open AO process)? **It could happen in some special cases (e.g. collaborative missions with an ESA Member State).**

# General questions

- ◆ What will be the importance of the project maturity in the selection process for M missions? Will there be a possibility for projects in an early stage of definition to obtain an assessment study that will precisely help them to become more mature? **Should the advisory structure strongly recommend a project whose design maturity is still relatively low, it would be studied, on condition that the technology is sufficiently mature.**

# General questions

- ◆ How will “conflicts of interest” (e.g. participation to proposals of members of the Advisory Structure and of the SPC) be treated? **A policy is being prepared, to be discussed at upcoming SSAC meeting. Clearly, scientists involved in a proposal will not assess it (or competing proposals).**

# General questions

- ◆ Is it possible to submit proposals with significantly different options? **Nothing prevents proposers from including options. However this should not detract from the concept's level of definition.**
- ◆ What will happen with M proposals just at the margin of the 300 Meuro limit? Will they be rejected or shifted to the L mission class? **It will depend from the degree of maturity in the cost estimate.**

# General questions

- ◆ Will the evaluation process allow for detailed technical questions from the referees to the proposers? Will the proposers have a chance to reply to referee's technical questions? **This may happen if the advisory structure wants to implement it.**
- ◆ What does 'management' mean in section "Overall proposed mission management structure"? **It refers to the whole mission, i.e. who will build what, who will operate the mission, will it be an observatory or a PI mission, etc.**

April 11, 2007

Briefing to CV2015 proposers

# General questions

- ◆ Will ESA assess during the selection phase whether the proposed payload is feasible? **Yes.**
- ◆ Is ESA going to assess the cost of the payload and whether that cost can be covered by National Agencies? **Yes.**



# General questions

- ◆ Some proposals are not only of interest to the prime advisory bodies (astrophysics) but also to the other advisory bodies (fundamental physics, solar system) **Proposals which are deemed to be of interest to more than one area will be reviewed by all the relevant advisory bodies.**

# General questions

- ◆ Present or recommended ESA policy (if any) on data rights. **ESA Council resolution applies (i.e. data will be public after no more than a 1 year proprietary period). Shorter proprietary periods are possible.**

*The end*