

Gemini Observatory Instrument Upgrades Program
Proposers Conference
3 November 2016
2:00pm US MT

In Attendance:

Gemini IUP Team:

Ruben Diaz, *Instrument Program Scientist*, Stephen Goodsell, *Instrument Program Manager*; Scot Kleinman, *Associate Director of Development*; Cathy Blough, *Project Support*; Eric Tollestrup, *Senior Instrument Scientist*; Marie Lemoine-Busserolle, *Project Scientist*, John Basset, *Systems Engineer*; and Karen Godzyk, *AURA Contracts Officer*.

Gemini Science and Technology Committee:

Tom Barnes, *University of Texas Austin*.

Participants:

Jennifer Marshall, *Texas A&M University*.

Luke Schmidt, *Texas A&M University*.

Andrew Sheinis, *Australian Astronomical Observatory*.

Andreas Seifahrt, *University of Chicago*.

Greg Wade, *Royal College of Canada*.

Dani Guzman, *Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile*.

Leslie Saddlemeier, *National Research Council of Canada*.

John Pazder, *National Research Council of Canada*.

Matthew Knight, *University of Maryland*.

Allyn Smith, *Austin Peay State University*.

Jamie Lomax, *University of Washington*.

Dimitri Monid, *National Research Council of Canada*.

Questions and Answers

Question 1:

You list specific instruments we are allowed to upgrade. Are you willing to entertain upgrades that feed multiple instruments but don't actually exist in the instrument space?

Answer 1:

Yes. The goal of this program is to add additional capabilities to our current facility instruments. If you do something that adds new capability to those instruments, "you're good."

Question 2:

That would include Altair as well?

Answer 2:

No, we are not including AO in this program at this time. If you have some ideas, please talk to us and we'll see if we have another program for that.

Question 3:

Your budget leaves room for proposers to incorporate contributions from their own institutions or from their partner institutions. How will that be weighed in the review process if we decide to contribute labor or some funding to the proposal?

Answer 3:

If you provide more value to Gemini through in-kind contributions than the amount requested, we would consider that in the evaluation process as a plus in the consideration. In the RFP main document, there is a paragraph on the selection process including two relevant considerations: the cost analysis and price analysis. This is where we would consider the value of any offered in-kind contributions.

Question 5:

In regard to the telescope time, what is the timeline for that request? Is that between now and the proposal deadline?

Answer 5:

Your request for telescope time is part of the proposal submission and thus, is due at the same time as the proposal.

Question 6:

Can you remind us of the deadline of the Notice of Intent?

Answer 6:

December 2, 2016.

Question 7:

Will the Notices of Intent be published?

Answer 7:

No, the Notices of Intent will not be published.

Question 8:

What do you mean by "technical requirements?" "Technical challenges?"

Answer 8:

We mean the technical requirements that you include in your proposal for the instrument upgrade you are proposing.

Question 9:

How does Gemini evaluate the technical requirements?

Answer 9:

In the RFP main document, at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6, there is a list of considerations that the evaluation panel would use to judge the proposal against.

Question 10:

When will proposers be notified of their selection?

Answer 10:

Gemini recommends the selection to its governance and notifies the proposers only after the final approvals are complete.

Question 11:

Do you have a sample surety plan that can be distributed?

Answer 11:

Yes, we provide an example at <http://www.gemini.edu/sciops/instruments/iup/Sample-Surety-Plan.docx>

Question 12:

The proposal form on page 4 says that AURA “prefers to pay the fixed price as a single lump sum after the completion of the work.” Would you be willing to pay for hardware purchases as they occur, especially those that require advance payment?

Answer 12:

The key word is “prefers.” You are free to propose an alternative milestone payment schedule as long as payments are correlated with the work performed. Advance payment for hardware purchases would satisfy that criterion.

Question 13:

Will Gemini consider ordering hardware itself to deliver to the team in order to save fees and custom taxes?

Answer 13:

Yes. The budget would need to include the costs that Gemini is paying directly. Gemini will evaluate the request on its added value and available resources to complete. In some cases, Gemini may prefer to reduce its workload and pay more overhead.

Question 14:

What is the access for technical information? What is the process for getting technical information? We will want access to optical and mechanical drawings of systems and components. Do we make a public request for the qualitative information that we want? Or do we get access to a drawing list and we can ask for specific drawings or a document list by perusing docushare or ask you to list out the documents for a particular instrument?

Answer 14:

Send all requests to rfpiup@gemini.edu. We will then either provide the information requested or arrange a discussion with the appropriate Gemini staff member to get you the information you need, within our ability to do so.

Question 15:

Will all information requests be made public so that all proposers will be able to see information requested by other proposers?

Answer 15:

No. We will provide any team the technical information it requests, provided we are able to do so. We will make public all questions and clarifications regarding the RfP itself.

Question 16:

Do you have an expected target turnaround time for providing information?

Answer 16:

The turnaround time will depend on the complexity of the requirement. However, questions or requests for clarification regarding requirements or specifications must be submitted by email and must be received at least 10 working days before the proposal due date.