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September 30, Annually Thereafter

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

This solicitation provides for a coordinated review of Research Data Center (RDC) proposals that previously had been submitted to and reviewed by individual programs in SBE. RDC proposals now should be submitted directly to this solicitation.

The solicitation provides specific guidance regarding the preparation of RDC proposals that deviates from general guidance in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide and the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide.

This solicitation identifies special competition-specific evaluation criteria that complement the standard NSF merit review criteria.

This solicitation specifies that only one proposal may be submitted for an RDC. If multiple organizations are participating in the establishment of an RDC, support for secondary organizations must be made via subawards from the lead organization. Of the two types of collaborative proposal formats described in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide, this solicitation allows only a single proposal submission with subawards administered by a lead organization.

Important Information

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the revised NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG) (NSF 18-1), which is effective for proposals submitted, or due, on or after January 29, 2018.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

General Information

Program Title:
 Restricted-Access Research Data Centers (RDCs)

Synopsis of Program:
 This solicitation invites proposals for the establishment of new Research Data Centers (RDCs). RDCs are secure Census Bureau facilities within which external researchers are given access to confidential micro data in accordance with specific statutory requirements. NSF will provide start-up costs for new RDC facilities. Potential investigators first must contact Census regarding the feasibility of sponsoring an RDC prior to submitting a proposal to NSF.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

Please note that the following information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

- Cheryl L. Eavey, telephone: (703) 292-7269, email: ceavey@nsf.gov
- Nancy A. Lutz, telephone: (703) 292-7280, email: nlutz@nsf.gov
- Thomas J. Baerwald, telephone: (703) 292-7301, email: tbaerwal@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):

- 47.075 --- Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences
**Award Information**

**Anticipated Type of Award:** Standard Grant or Continuing Grant  
**Estimated Number of Awards:** 1 to 3  
In any given year, NSF expects to support no more than three RDC awards.  
**Anticipated Funding Amount:** $100,000 to $300,000  
Investigators may request up to $100,000 a year over a one-year to three-year period to cover start-up costs for new RDCs. NSF programs collectively expect to contribute no more than $300,000 per year to new RDC awards, pending availability of appropriations.

**Eligibility Information**

**Who May Submit Proposals:**
Proposals may only be submitted by the following:
- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members. Special instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of subawards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.
- Non-profit, non-academic organizations: Independent museums, observatories, research labs, professional societies and similar organizations in the U.S. associated with educational or research activities.

**Who May Serve as PI:**
There are no restrictions or limits.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:**
There are no restrictions or limits.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI:**
There are no restrictions or limits.

**Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions**

**A. Proposal Preparation Instructions**
- **Letters of Intent:** Not required  
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required  
- **Full Proposals:**

**B. Budgetary Information**
- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**
  Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.
- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**
  Not Applicable
- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**
  Not Applicable

**C. Due Dates**
- **Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter’s local time):**
Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:
National Science Board approved criteria. Additional merit review considerations apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

Award Administration Information

Award Conditions:
Standard NSF award conditions apply.

Reporting Requirements:
Standard NSF reporting requirements apply.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990s, NSF and the Census Bureau have collaborated on the establishment of Research Data Centers (RDCs). RDCs are secure Census Bureau facilities within which external researchers are given access to confidential micro data in accordance with specific statutory requirements. Because of the nature of the data and statutory legal requirements, research conducted at RDCs takes place under a set of rules and limitations that are considerably more constrained than those prevailing in typical research environments. The advantage of the Census RDCs, however, is that researchers are able to conduct research that would not be possible without access to respondent-level information.

As of 2014, there were 17 RDC locations. (Information about the current RDCs is available at https://www.census.gov/ces/rdcresearch/)

This solicitation invites proposals for the establishment of a limited number of new RDCs. RDCs are expected to engage researchers from across the social, behavioral, and economic sciences. NSF will provide start-up costs for new RDC facilities. Potential investigators first must contact Census regarding the feasibility of sponsoring an RDC prior to submitting a proposal to NSF. See the
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

NSF expects to support a limited number of new RDCs that complement the existing RDCs by expanding access to secure data to a broader segment of the social, behavioral, and economic sciences research community. RDC proposals should address the following topics:

1. The cross-disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary potential of the proposed RDC. Which social, behavioral, and economic science communities will benefit or have the potential to benefit from the proposed RDC? How does the proposed RDC plan to conduct outreach to bring into the center a broad and diverse range of scholars?
2. The fit of the proposed RDC within the existing system. What is the geographic proximity of the proposed RDC to other RDCs? Are there ease of access issues that would make the proposed RDC particularly attractive? Does the proposed RDC have unique elements not available at the existing RDCs?
3. Readiness of the proposed RDC. What is the demand for an RDC in the proposed site? Are there institutions in the surrounding area whose researchers would make use of the proposed RDC? Are there projects currently in the planning stages or in process that could make immediate use of the proposed RDC? Would these projects meet the Census Bureau’s requirement of providing benefit to Census Bureau and other Federal statistical agency programs?
4. Governance. How will the proposed RDC be governed? Does the proposed RDC leadership have the qualifications to ensure a well-managed RDC? Is the proposed staffing adequate to handle the work of the RDC?
5. Resources available to the RDC. Where will the RDC be housed? Is the physical space adequate, accessible, and secure? Is adequate institutional commitment to the RDC demonstrated? Although this topic may be alluded to in the Project Description, the bulk of this information should be included under Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources. The description should be narrative in nature and must not include any quantifiable financial information.

Note: Regarding Proposals Involving Multiple Organizations

In the case of proposals involving multiple organizations, a single organization must be identified as the lead, and a single proposal describing the entire project must be submitted by that organization. Funds may be distributed among partner organizations via subawards from the lead organization. A budget on the standard NSF budget form should be submitted for each subawardee. Of the two types of collaborative proposal formats described in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide, this solicitation allows only a single proposal submission with subawards administered by that lead organization. Direct submission of linked collaborative sets of proposals by multiple organizations is not permitted.

III. AWARD INFORMATION

Anticipated Type of Award: Continuing Grant or Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 1 to 3

In any given year, NSF expects to support no more than three RDC awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $100,000 to $300,000

Investigators may request up to $100,000 a year over a one-year to three-year period to cover start-up costs for new RDCs. NSF programs collectively expect to contribute no more than $300,000 per year to new RDC awards, pending availability of appropriations.

The level of commitment per proposal and total number of awards made will depend upon the outcome of the review process and available resources.

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members. Special Instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of subawards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.
- Non-profit, non-academic organizations: Independent museums, observatories, research labs, professional societies and similar organizations in the U.S. associated with educational or research activities.

Who May Serve as PI:
There are no restrictions or limits.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:**

There are no restrictions or limits.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI:**

There are no restrictions or limits.

---

**V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**

**A. Proposal Preparation Instructions**

**Full Proposal Preparation Instructions:** Proposers may opt to submit proposals in response to this Program Solicitation via Grants.gov or via the NSF FastLane system.

- Full proposals submitted via FastLane: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. Proposers are reminded to identify this program solicitation number in the program solicitation block on the NSF Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.

- Full proposals submitted via Grants.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation via Grants.gov should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov. The complete text of the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: (https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide). To obtain copies of the Application Guide and Application Forms Package, click on the Apply tab on the Grants.gov site, then click on the Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Application Instructions link and enter the funding opportunity number, (the program solicitation number without the NSF prefix) and press the Download Package button. Paper copies of the Grants.gov Application Guide also may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. See Chapter II.C.2 of the PAPPG for guidance on the required sections of a full research proposal submitted to NSF. Please note that the proposal preparation instructions provided in this program solicitation may deviate from the PAPPG instructions.

**Proposal Sections with Special Instructions for Proposals Submitted in Response to This Solicitation**

**Cover Sheet**

The RDC proposal title should begin with "Research Data Centers:,” followed by a substantive subtitle, which should describe the project in concise, informative language so that a scientifically or technically literate reader could understand what the project is about. Applicants should not use "cute" or "attention-grabbing" subtitles, because such phrases may lead reviewers to question the intellectual significance of the project.

**Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources**

This section should provide a synopsis of institutional resources that will be available to the RDC. In order for NSF and its reviewers to assess the scope of a proposed project, all resources (including those from partner organizations) available to the project must be described in this section. The description should be narrative in nature and must not include any quantifiable financial information. See Chapter II.C.2.i in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (or the comparable section in the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide for further guidance.

**Special Information and Supplementary Documentation**

Following are supplementary documents for which special instructions are provided for proposals submitted in response to this solicitation that supplement guidance in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide and the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide:

**Data Management Plan**

Because of the distinctive character of an RDC and the nature of these awards to support establishment of new RDCs, the following text should be specified as the NSF-required Data Management Plan for this proposal:

**RDC Data Management Plan**

Any data made available to researcher or data generated through research conducted in this new RDC will be subject to Census Bureau requirements related to access and distribution of data.

**Letters of Collaboration**

Brief statements, whether written as letters or as free-standing e-mail messages from individuals and/or organizations that will work with...
the PIs and/or provide in-kind support for the proposed project, may be included as supplementary documents. Such letters are not
needed from individuals included as senior personnel on a project or from subawardee organizations, because their involvement in the
project is affirmed by the inclusion of their biographical sketches and/or subaward budgets.

Letters of collaboration should focus solely on the willingness of the letter's author to collaborate or provide in-kind support for the
project in ways that have been outlined in the Project Description or Facilities, Equipment, or Other Resources sections of the proposal.
Such letters should not argue for support of the project by articulating in greater detail what activities the collaborator will undertake
and/or by elaborating reasons for supporting the project. Such additional text may be included elsewhere in the proposal but is not
permitted in a supplementary document.

The text provided by the letter's author must be brief and to the point. Letters of collaboration may not include quantifiable
financial information. Failure to comply may result in the removal of the letters from the proposal or the proposal being returned without
review.

Other Supplementary Documentation

Unless approved by an NSF program officer associated with this solicitation prior to the submission deadline, no additional
supplementary documentation may be permitted in this proposal.

Proposals Involving Multiple Organizations

In the case of proposals involving multiple organizations, a single organization must be identified as the lead, and a single proposal
describing the entire project must be submitted by that organization. Funds may be distributed among partner organizations via
subawards from the lead organization. A budget on the standard NSF budget form should be submitted for each subawardee. Of the
two types of collaborative proposal formats described in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide, this solicitation allows only a single proposal
submission with subawards administered by that lead organization. Direct submission of linked collaborative sets of proposals by
multiple organizations is not permitted.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

Funding from NSF will be used to cover expenses that are allowable under NSF's usual policies and procedures such as salary for the
Executive Director of the RDC, rent for a dedicated RDC physical space, and payment for services rendered to the RDC by the Census
Bureau. Proposals may not include salary for the on-site Census Bureau employee.

C. Due Dates

- Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):
  September 30, 2015
  September 30, Annually Thereafter

D. FastLane/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via FastLane:

To prepare and submit a proposal via FastLane, see detailed technical instructions available at:
https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm. For FastLane user support, call the FastLane Help Desk at 1-800-673-6188 or e-mail fastlane@nsf.gov. The FastLane Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of
the FastLane system. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program
staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this funding opportunity.

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once
registered, the applicant's organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website.
Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage:
http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants.html. In addition, the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide (see link in
Section V.A) provides instructions regarding the technical preparation of proposals via Grants.gov. For Grants.gov
user support, contact the Grants.gov Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or by email: support@grants.gov. The
Grants.gov Contact Center answers general technical questions related to the use of Grants.gov. Specific questions
related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this
solicitation.

Submitting the Proposal: Once all documents have been completed, the Authorized Organizational Representative
(AOR) must submit the application to Grants.gov and verify the desired funding opportunity and agency to which the
application is submitted. The AOR must then sign and submit the application to Grants.gov. The completed
application will be transferred to the NSF FastLane system for further processing.
Proposers that submitted via FastLane are strongly encouraged to use FastLane to verify the status of their submission to NSF. For proposers that submitted via Grants.gov, until an application has been received and validated by NSF, the Authorized Organizational Representative may check the status of an application on Grants.gov. After proposers have received an e-mail notification from NSF, Research.gov should be used to check the status of an application.

**VI. NSF PROPOSAL PROCESSING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES**

Proposals received by NSF are assigned to the appropriate NSF program for acknowledgement and, if they meet NSF requirements, for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an NSF Program Officer, and usually by three to ten other persons outside NSF either as ad hoc reviewers, panelists, or both, who are experts in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with oversight of the review process. Proposers are invited to suggest names of persons they believe are especially well qualified to review the proposal and/or persons they would prefer not to review the proposal. These suggestions may serve as one source in the reviewer selection process at the Program Officer’s discretion. Submission of such names, however, is optional. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition, Program Officers may obtain comments from site visits before recommending final action on proposals. Senior NSF staff further review recommendations for awards. A flowchart that depicts the entire NSF proposal and award process (and associated timeline) is included in PAPPG Exhibit III-1.

A comprehensive description of the Foundation’s merit review process is available on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/.

Proposers should also be aware of core strategies that are essential to the fulfillment of NSF’s mission, as articulated in Building the Future: Investing in Discovery and Innovation - NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years (FY) 2018 – 2022. These strategies are integrated in the program planning and implementation process, of which proposal review is one part. NSF’s mission is particularly well-implemented through the integration of research and education and broadening participation in NSF programs, projects, and activities.

One of the strategic objectives in support of NSF’s mission is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions must recruit, train, and prepare a diverse STEM workforce to advance the frontiers of science and participate in the U.S. technology-based economy. NSF’s contribution to the national innovation ecosystem is to provide cutting-edge research under the guidance of the Nation’s most creative scientists and engineers. NSF also supports development of a strong science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce by investing in building the knowledge that informs improvements in STEM teaching and learning.

NSF’s mission calls for the broadening of opportunities and expanding participation of groups, institutions, and geographic regions that are underrepresented in STEM disciplines, which is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

**A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria**

The National Science Foundation strives to invest in a robust and diverse portfolio of projects that creates new knowledge and enables breakthroughs in understanding across all areas of science and engineering research and education. To identify which projects to support, NSF relies on a merit review process that incorporates consideration of both the technical aspects of a proposed project and its potential to contribute more broadly to advancing NSF’s mission “to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.” NSF makes every effort to conduct a fair, competitive, transparent merit review process for the selection of projects.

1. Merit Review Principles

These principles are to be given due diligence by PIs and organizations when preparing proposals and managing projects, by reviewers when reading and evaluating proposals, and by NSF program staff when determining whether or not to recommend proposals for funding and while overseeing awards. Given that NSF is the primary federal agency charged with nurturing and supporting excellence in basic research and education, the following three principles apply:

- All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- NSF projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals. These “Broader Impacts” may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified.
- Meaningful assessment and evaluation of NSF funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects. If the size of the activity is limited, evaluation of that activity in isolation is not likely to be meaningful. Thus, assessing the effectiveness of these activities may best be done at a higher, more aggregated, level than the individual project.

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of those activities.

These three merit review principles provide the basis for the merit review criteria, as well as a context within which the users of the criteria can better understand their intent.
2. Merit Review Criteria

All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of the two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities.

The two merit review criteria are listed below. Both criteria are to be given full consideration during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria. (PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i) contains additional information for use by proposers in development of the Project Description section of the proposal. Reviewers are strongly encouraged to review the criteria, including PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i), prior to the review of a proposal.

When evaluating NSF proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit**: The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and
- **Broader Impacts**: The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
   a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
   b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. NSF values the advancement of scientific knowledge and activities that contribute to achievement of societally relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and underrepresented minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); improved STEM education and educator development at any level; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive STEM workforce; increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others; improved national security; increased economic competitiveness of the United States; and enhanced infrastructure for research and education.

Proposers are reminded that reviewers will also be asked to review the Data Management Plan and the Postdoctoral Researcher Mentoring Plan, as appropriate.

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

While addressing the Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts of the proposed activities, reviewers will be asked to evaluate the extent to which the proposal successfully addresses the topics covered in the Project Description for this solicitation.

In particular, reviewers will be asked to specifically address the following:

1. What is the cross-disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary potential of the proposed RDC?
2. What will the proposed RDC add to the current network of RDCs?
3. To what extent has the proposal demonstrated that the proposed RDC is viable?

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by Ad hoc Review and/or Panel Review.

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two National Science Board approved merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will be completed and submitted by each reviewer. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

NSF will coordinate and manage the review of proposals jointly with the Census Bureau. Relevant information about proposals and unattributed reviews of proposals will be shared with the Census Bureau as appropriate. In consultation with Census, NSF will select proposals to be funded following the review process.

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer’s recommendation.

After programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications. After an administrative review has occurred, Grants and Agreements Officers perform the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants
and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at their own risk.

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to the submitting organization by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See Section VI.B. for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award notice, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3) the proposal referenced in the award notice; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (GC-1)*; or Research Terms and Conditions* and (5) any announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award notice. Cooperative agreements also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Financial and Administrative Terms and Conditions (CA-FATC) and the applicable Programmatic Terms and Conditions. NSF awards are electronically signed by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer and transmitted electronically to the organization via e-mail.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF’s Website at https://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.


C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the Principal Investigator must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer no later than 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. (Some programs or awards require submission of more frequent project reports). No later than 120 days following expiration of a grant, the PI also is required to submit a final project report, and a project outcomes report for the general public.

Failure to provide the required annual or final project reports, or the project outcomes report, will delay NSF review and processing of any future funding increments as well as any pending proposals for all identified PIs and co-PIs on a given award. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

PIs are required to use NSF’s electronic project-reporting system, available through Research.gov, for preparation and submission of annual and final project reports. Such reports provide information on accomplishments, project participants (individual and organizational), publications, and other specific products and impacts of the project. Submission of the report via Research.gov constitutes certification by the PI that the contents of the report are accurate and complete. The project outcomes report also must be prepared and submitted using Research.gov. This report serves as a brief summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project. This report will be posted on the NSF website exactly as it is submitted by the PI.


VIII. AGENCY CONTACTS

Please note that the program contact information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:
Cheryl L. Eavey, telephone: (703) 292-7269, email: ceavey@nsf.gov
Nancy A. Lutz, telephone: (703) 292-7280, email: nlutz@nsf.gov
Thomas J. Baerwald, telephone: (703) 292-7301, email: tbaerwal@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact:
FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1-800-673-6188; e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:
Grants.gov Contact Center: If the Authorized Organizational Representatives (AOR) has not received a confirmation message from Grants.gov within 48 hours of submission of application, please contact via telephone: 1-800-518-4726; e-mail: support@grants.gov.

IX. OTHER INFORMATION

The NSF website provides the most comprehensive source of information on NSF Directorates (including contact information), programs and funding opportunities. Use of this website by potential proposers is strongly encouraged. In addition, "NSF Update" is an information-delivery system designed to keep potential proposers and other interested parties apprised of new NSF funding opportunities and publications, important changes in proposal and award policies and procedures, and upcoming NSF Grants Conferences. Subscribers are informed through e-mail or the user's Web browser each time new publications are issued that match their identified interests. "NSF Update" also is available on NSF’s website.

Grants.gov provides an additional electronic capability to search for Federal government-wide grant opportunities. NSF funding opportunities may be accessed via this mechanism. Further information on Grants.gov may be obtained at http://www.grants.gov.

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent Federal agency created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 USC 1861-75). The Act states the purpose of the NSF is "to promote the progress of science; [and] to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare by supporting research and education in all fields of science and engineering."

NSF funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K-12 school systems, businesses, informal science organizations and other research organizations throughout the US. The Foundation accounts for about one-fourth of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

NSF receives approximately 55,000 proposals each year for research, education and training projects, of which approximately 11,000 are funded. In addition, the Foundation receives several thousand applications for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. The agency operates no laboratories itself but does support National Research Centers, user facilities, certain oceanographic vessels and Arctic and Antarctic research stations. The Foundation also supports cooperative research between universities and industry, US participation in international scientific and engineering efforts, and educational activities at every academic level.

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide Chapter II.E.6 for instructions regarding preparation of these types of proposals.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090 and (800) 281-8749, FIRS at (800) 877-8339.

The National Science Foundation Information Center may be reached at (703) 292-5111.

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov

- Location: 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314
- For General Information (NSF Information Center): (703) 292-5111
- TDD (for the hearing-impaired): (703) 292-5090
- To Order Publications or Forms:
Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov
or telephone: (703) 292-7827

To Locate NSF Employees: (703) 292-5111

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding applicants or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004), and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004). Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding the burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

Suzanne H. Plimpton
Reports Clearance Officer
Office of the General Counsel
National Science Foundation
Alexandria, VA 22314