

2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Ocean Sciences

Report Run Date: 04/28/2021 11:12:15 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
National Science Foundation		2021	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Proposal Review Panel for Ocean Sciences		10752	
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	06/28/2019	06/28/2021	
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
No			
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
11. Establishment Authority	Agency Authority		
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
ADM IV-100	10/01/1993	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee	Grant Review Committee		
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear		
17a. Open Meetings and Dates	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities
No Meetings	0	0	0
17d. Total	0		

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00

19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)

0.00 0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The scope and objectives are to advise the National Science Foundation (NSF) on the merit of proposals requesting financial support of research and research-related activities. The panel will review proposals submitted to NSF under the purview of the Division of Ocean Sciences (OCE). The duties and responsibilities are to review and evaluate proposals, which may include site visits, and provide written recommendations on proposals as part of the selection process for awards.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Members are selected to be representative of the scientific areas encompassed by OCE activities. Every effort is made to achieve a diverse membership with representation including individuals from underrepresented groups and different geographic regions.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

Estimated Number of Meetings per Year - 20 Total Meetings - 17

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is essential because the broad scientific base represented by the division transcends the ability of NSF staff to evaluate proposals thoroughly so that outside advice from practicing scientists is essential both for fair peer evaluation of proposals and for effective scientific long-range planning. The essence of the peer review system is that those scientists most knowledgeable about a field be the judge of the worthiness and importance of a proposal in the field. This requires the division to consult with many members of the scientific community to insure fair and reasonable evaluation of a proposal.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

These meetings are closed because the proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552b(c), (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

21. Remarks

Designated Federal Officer

Terrence M Quinn Division Director

Narrative Description

The NSF mission is set out in the NSF Act of 1950 authorizes and directs the Agency to initiate and support: basic scientific research and research fundamental to the engineering process; and science and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields of science and engineering. The involvement of knowledgeable peers from outside the Foundation in the review of proposals is the keystone of NSF's proposal review system. Their judgments of the extent to which proposals address the merit review criteria are vital for informing NSF staff and influencing funding recommendations.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- Improvements to health or safety
- Trust in government
- Major policy changes
- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements
- Other

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000
- Over \$10,000,000

Cost Savings Comments

The use of panelists to review proposals for the Agency is an invaluable asset. The cost of obtaining the expertise, insight, and information received by the Division using alternative methods, such as hiring the expertise as full or part-time employees, would be extremely high.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

1,080

Number of Recommendations Comments

The Number of recommendations is for the fiscal year.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

100%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The word implement is not applicable to grant review panels. All recommendations are considered by the agency.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Not applicable. Please see answer directly above.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

Although panelists may not receive direct feedback, each committee member may use the NSF FastLane, a public web-based program, which provides information on awards made by agency to determine the outcome of proposals reviewed by the panel.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

- Reorganized Priorities
- Reallocated resources
- Issued new regulation
- Proposed legislation
- Approved grants or other payments
- Other

Action Comments

N/A

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

- What is the estimated **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 1,083
- What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 373
- What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$235,918,615

Grant Review Comments

The panelists/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall rating. The number of proposals above includes pre-proposals submitted to NSF for review. The pre-proposals are not included in the number of grants recommend or dollar value of grants recommended for approval.

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- Contact DFO
- Online Agency Web Site
- Online Committee Web Site
- Online GSA FACA Web Site
- Publications
- Other

Access Comments

N/A