

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Atmospheric and Geospace Sciences

Report Run Date: 04/29/2021 01:24:57 PM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Atmospheric and Geospace Sciences

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

No.

10751

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

06/28/2019

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/28/2021

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear

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

10/01/1993

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this FiscalYear

### 17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 0

No Meetings

### 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

<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18d. Total</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?**

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 committee will review and evaluate proposals submitted to NSF under the purview of the Division of Atmospheric and Geospace Sciences (AGS). Also, the committee's 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. The Committee may evaluate and provide advice on the progress of awarded proposals.

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

Members are selected to achieve a balance of viewpoints and expertise in the scientific areas and types of institutions encompassed by AGS activities. To the extent practicable, effort is made to achieve a diverse membership with representation that includes individuals from underrepresented groups and different geographic regions. It is anticipated that members will be comprised of Special Government Employees (SGE) and Regular Government Employees (RGE).

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

There were approximately 8 meetings held this year. The subject and number of proposals to be reviewed determine the number of members attending each meeting. The Committee will continue indefinitely with renewals of the charter biennially in accordance with Section 14 of FACA.

**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**

N/A

**Designated Federal Officer**

Anjuli S. Bamzai 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 Other

**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?**

216

**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. 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	<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 <b><u>Number</u></b> of grants reviewed for approval	216
What is the estimated <b><u>Number</u></b> of grants recommended for approval	112
What is the estimated <b><u>Dollar Value</u></b> of grants recommended for approval	\$41,721,153

**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