

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations

Report Run Date: 05/10/2021 07:01:41 PM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

1192

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

No

### 5. Current Charter

06/29/2020

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/29/2022

### 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

08/30/1990

### 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 committees serve as advisory panels to the program officers for the evaluation of proposals for selected NSF programs. These panels provide recommendations to the program officers as to which of the submitted proposals should and should not be funded. While the panels are advisory, their recommendations are normally the most significant factor in the decision making process. While the workload is solely dependent on the number of proposals that are reviewed in this manner, in the typical panel setting, each individual will review about ten proposals. This requires approximately 30 days of effort before the panel meeting. The meeting typically requires one to two days of effort, with an additional day required for travel.

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

Panelists for the sessions are selected based on their knowledge of the fields represented by the proposals submitted. At the same time, every effort is made to insure a diversity that approximates that found in the research community. Representatives are included from both major research centers and smaller colleges and universities. Representatives from non-academic organizations are included wherever appropriate. Members of underrepresented populations in computer and information science and engineering are included.

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

Meetings are held as required to fulfill the mission of the Division. In this fiscal year seventy panels were held to assist in the evaluation of regular research proposals, in the areas such as Algorithmic Foundations, Communications & Information Foundations, Software and Hardware Foundations, Exploiting Parallelism and Scalability, Cyber-Innovation for Sustainability Science and Engineering, Expeditions and Algorithms in the Field. The number is determined by the number of proposals to be reviewed and the need for as timely review as possible within the limited resources available for support of the panel.

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

Merit review represents the recognized strength of the National Science Foundation. While a mail merit review is possible mail reviewers generally are used for additional reviews to meet the rating requirements and/or for judgment normally made about a single

proposal viewed in isolation. The panel provides the unique opportunity for the reviewers to calibrate their reviews based on comparative merits for all proposals submitted within a single complex, or multidisciplinary proposals.

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

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

**21. Remarks**

None

**Designated Federal Officer**

Rance Cleaveland Division Director, CCF

**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 judgements 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                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Trust in government                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Major policy changes                              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Advance in scientific research                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Increased customer satisfaction                   | <input checked="" 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
- 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?**

1,680

**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 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>Number</b> of grants reviewed for approval	1,623
What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants recommended for approval	460
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants recommended for approval	\$223,402,334

**Grant Review Comments**

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

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

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>

Online Committee Web Site  
Online GSA FACA Web Site  
Publications  
Other



**Access Comments**

N/A