2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation

Report Run Date: 06/07/2025 09:52:32 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
National Science Foundation		2025	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Proposal Review Panel for Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation		1194	
4. Is this New D	uring 5. Current 6.	Expected	7. Expected
Fiscal Year?	Charter Re	enewal Date	Term Date
No	06/28/2024 06	/28/2026	
8a. Was Termin FiscalYear?	8b. Spe ated During Termin Author	ation	8c. Actual Term Date
No			
9. Agency			10b.
Recommendation FiscalYear	on for Next	gislation Terminate?	Legislation Pending?
Recommendation	on for Next	-	Legislation
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue	on for Next Req to	Terminate?	Legislation Pending?
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue	No	Terminate?	Legislation Pending?
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue 11. Establishme 12. Specific Establishment	n for Next Req to No ent Authority Agenc 13. Effective Date	y Authority 14. Commitee	Legislation Pending? Not Applicable 14c.
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue 11. Establishmen 12. Specific Establishment Authority ADM IV-100	n for Next Req to No ent Authority Agenc 13. Effective Date	y Authority 14. Commitee Type Continuing	Legislation Pending? Not Applicable 14c. Presidential? No
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue 11. Establishmen 12. Specific Establishment Authority ADM IV-100	No No No No I3. Effective Date 08/16/1990	y Authority 14. Commitee Type Continuing	Legislation Pending? Not Applicable 14c. Presidential? No
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue 11. Establishme 12. Specific Establishment Authority ADM IV-100 15. Description 16a. Total Number of Reports 17a	No ent Authority Agence 13. Effective Date 08/16/1990 of Committee Gran No Reports for this FiscalYear	Terminate? Y Authority 14. Commitee Type Continuing t Review Cor	Legislation Pending? Not Applicable 14c. Presidential? No
Recommendation FiscalYear Continue 11. Establishme 12. Specific Establishment Authority ADM IV-100 15. Description 16a. Total Number of Reports 17a. 0 17b. Clo	No Ant Authority Agence 13. Effective Date 08/16/1990 of Committee Gran No Reports for this FiscalYear Seed 0 17c. Partially	Terminate? Y Authority 14. Commitee Type Continuing t Review Cor	Legislation Pending? Not Applicable 14c. Presidential? No mmittee

Current Next

гν

	FY	FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to	\$0 (00\$0.00
Non-Federal Members	φon	
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to	\$0.00 \$0.00	
Federal Members		υψ0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to	\$0 (00\$0.00
Federal Staff	ψ0.0	υψ0.00
8a(4). Personnel Pmts to		00\$0.00
Non-Member Consultants	φ0.0	υφυ.υυ
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.00\$0.00	00 00 00
Non-Federal Members		JU 40.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to	ድር በ	00\$0.00
Federal Members	ψ0.0	υψ0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0 (00\$0.00
Federal Staff	ψ0.0	υψ0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0 (00\$0.00
Non-member Consultants	ψ0.00 ψ0.00	
18c. Other(rents,user charges,	\$0 (00\$0.00
graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	ψ0.00 ψ0.00	
18d. Total	\$0.0	00\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years	0.0	00.0 00
(FTE)	0.0	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

These panels reviewed approximately 2,007 unsolicited proposals submitted to the six Division program elements as well as submissions in response to special initiatives (i.e., EPA/NSF, NSF/DARPA initiatives, etc.) and NSF-wide annual solicitations (CAREER, REG, MRI, SBIR, NIRT, NER, NSEC). These panels review and make recommendations for the disposition of 95% of the proposals received in the Division. The other 5% are mail reviewed and, in special cases, internally reviewed.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Membership in all panels reflects an appropriate mix of academic and industrial expertise in accordance with each program area. Efforts are also made to reflect an appropriate balance of women, minorities and disabled members, as well as geographic representation.

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

During FY24 167 proposal review panels were held to review these proposals.

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

The only other option for the proposal review process is mail review. This option is not feasible given the current volume of proposals received in the Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation (CMMI). Further, it is our assessment that providing the opportunity for reviewers to discuss and compare proposals improves the quality of the review process.

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

To review proposals that included information of a proprietary nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal infromation concerning individuals associated with the proposals.

21. Remarks None

Designated Federal Officer

Daniel Linzell Director, CMMI

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	

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 <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee? 2.027

Number of Recommendations Comments

The number of recommendations is for the fiscal year.

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

% 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 <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> implemented by the agency? 0%

% of Recommendations <u>Partially</u> 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 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	
Reallocated resources	
Issued new regulation	
Proposed legislation	
Approved grants or other payments	 Image: A start of the start of
Other	

Action Comments

NA

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

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approvalWhat is the estimated Number of grants recommended for 2,007approval314What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval\$142,649,779

Grant Review Comments

The panelists/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall ratingThe 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
\checkmark

Access Comments

N/A