

## 2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Earth Sciences

Report Run Date: 08/08/2025 07:18:06 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2025

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Earth Sciences

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

1569

### 4. Is this New Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

06/27/2025

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/27/2027

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

### 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

### 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

### 11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

### 12. Specific Establishment Authority

ADM IV-100

### 13. Effective Date

03/30/1984

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee

Grant Review Committee

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

### 17a. Open

0

### 17b. Closed

0

### 17c. Partially Closed

0

### Other Activities

0

### 17d. Total

0

### Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next  
FY FY

<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18e. Total Costs</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

Twenty-five panel committee meetings were held this year to review over 986 proposals submitted for funding by the Division of Earth Sciences. These committees advise program officers on the merits of these proposals, using the explicit merit review criteria defined by NSF in the grant proposal guide. The expertise of these many committee members is needed to help program officers make informed decisions on the awards to

be supported by the Division in any one year. The yearly budget of the Division of Earth Sciences is approximately \$196 million dollars.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The Division of Earth Sciences selects members that have the necessary scientific expertise to cover the many disciplines under review in any one year. The selection of committee members is also balanced in terms of geography and institutional types, demographic characteristics of the panelists, and stage in their academic careers.

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

The number of panel committee meetings varies according to the requirements of each solicited competition. Most of the research programs in the Division of Earth Sciences require one or two panel meetings per year, accounting for most of the 25 committee meetings listed in this report. Additional meetings associated with special competitions for federal dollars are added on a need basis. The vast majority of the proposals in the Division of Earth Sciences undergo evaluation of their merits using these panel meetings.

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

The range of scientific expertise comprised in these panels greatly expands the knowledge base available internally. Also, active scientists in the field have the state-of-the-art expertise needed to help program officers narrow down the awards to be recommended for funding, and balance the needs of the scientific community represented by each program. The advice provided by these panel committees is essential to make sure that

the health of the scientific community stays strong

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

The proposals contain confidential information and proprietary intellectual content that belong to the investigators and their institutions. As such, proposals submitted to NSF are treated confidentially throughout the merit review process.

**21. Remarks**

None

**Designated Federal Officer**

Dena Smith-Nufio Director, Division of Earth Sciences

**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 sciences and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields 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 judgements of the extent to which proposals address the merit review criteria are vital for informing NSF staff and influencing 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                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Increased customer satisfaction                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Other   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

### Outcome Comments

NA

### What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- |                            |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Unable to Determine        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Over \$10,000,000          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Cost Savings Other         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

### 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?

986

### Number of Recommendations Comments

This is an ongoing committee. Therefore, the number of recommendations produced by the committee 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

**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 panelist may not receive direct feedback, each committee member may use the NSF Fastlane, a public web-base program which provide information on awards made by the 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Action Comments**

NA

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

Yes

What is the estimated **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 986

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for

approval

337

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval

\$141,276,887

**Grant Review Comments**

The panelist/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall rating. The number of the proposals above include 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