

- 59 Proposal Review Panel for Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings
- 10748 Proposal Review Panel for Social and Economic Sciences
- 1766 Proposal Review Panel for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
- 84683 Proposal Review Panel for Translational Impacts
- 1214 Proposal Review Panel for Undergraduate Education

5. *Justification that the information or advice provided by the Federal advisory committee or subcommittee is not available from another Federal advisory committee, another Federal Government source, or any other more cost-effective and less burdensome source.*

Although individual evaluation (*i.e.*, mail review) of proposals is the usual method employed for merit review, combination of mail review and follow-up by panel review provides a more comprehensive basis and rationale for selecting awardees, since panel discussion of competing proposals focuses on strengths and weaknesses of competing proposals, and allows cross comparison of all proposals on a level playing field.

6. *If the consultation is a committee renewal, a summary of the previous accomplishments of the committee and the reasons it needs to continue.*

Past committees have been instrumental in identifying cutting edge topics and projects that pursue bold, innovative research that addresses national needs, strengthens U.S. leadership and fosters advances in new areas of fundamental or applied research, catalyzes development of new industries or capabilities that increase the leadership position for the country, and/or makes significant progress towards addressing a national need or grand challenge, particularly in current priority areas including, but not limited to, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, quantum information science, advanced materials, and advanced manufacturing. An example of a groundbreaking area identified by the committee is Quantum research in 2016 before it became a priority topic at NSF and subsequently a national initiative: the National Quantum Initiative.

7. *Explanation of why the committee/subcommittee is essential to the conduct of agency business.*

The MPS FACA committees are essential to the conduct of agency business as they align with the agency's usage of the merit review process and criteria in keeping with 42 U.S. Code 1862s, which outlines that "the Foundation's intellectual merit and broader impacts criteria are appropriate

for evaluating grant proposals" and directs the Foundation to "maintain the intellectual merit and broader impacts criteria, among other specific criteria as appropriate, as the basis for evaluating grant proposals in the merit review process." NSF's mission, as described in the 1950 NSF act, is "to promote the progress of science, advance national health, prosperity, and welfare, and secure the national defense. This is achieved by investing in research to expand knowledge in science, engineering, and education, and by increasing the capacity of the U.S. to conduct and benefit from such research. Merit review panels under these FACA committees serve as the basis for the gold standard merit review to support the most compelling research to advance the NSF mission.

This public interest determination documents that renewing the committee is essential to the conduct of agency business and that the information to be obtained is not already available through another advisory committee or source within the Federal Government.

Dated: May 26, 2026.

Crystal Robinson,

Committee Management Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2026-10695 Filed 5-28-26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations; Committee Renewal

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Committee Management Renewal.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) is renewing the committee for Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations.

DATES: NSF approves the continuation of this committee on 4/20/2026. Effective date for renewal is June 26, 2026. For more information, please contact Crystal Robinson, NSF, at (703) 292-8687.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Crystal Robinson, Committee Management Officer, NSF, at (703) 292-8687, or by mail to National Science Foundation, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NSF management officials having responsibility for the advisory committee listed below have determined that renewing this

committee for another two years is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed upon the Director, National Science Foundation (NSF), by 42 U.S.C. 1861 *et seq.* This determination follows consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

Committee

Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations, #1192

Pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 102-3.60(a), to establish, renew, reestablish, or merge a discretionary (agency discretion) advisory committee, an agency must first consult with the General Services Administration's Committee Management Secretariat (the Secretariat) and, as part of the consultation, provide a written public interest determination approved by the head of the agency to the Secretariat with a copy to the Office of Management and Budget. In addition, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 102-3.35, an agency shall follow the same consultation process and document in writing the same determination of need before creating a subcommittee under a discretionary committee that is not made up entirely of members of a parent advisory committee. Information on the following factors for the committee is provided to the Secretariat to demonstrate that renewing the committee is in the public interest:

1. *Annual budget:* \$268,526.00.
 - a. *Federal personnel on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis:* 3.52 FTE.
 - b. *Other Federal internal costs:* \$1,000.00.
 - c. *Proposed payments to members:* \$258,145.00.
 - d. *Proposed number of members:* 675.
 - e. *Reimbursable costs:* \$9,381.00.
2. *If applicable, the total dollar value of grants expected to be recommended during the fiscal year:* \$174,188,680.
3. *Criteria for selecting members to ensure the committee has the necessary expertise and fairly balanced membership.*

Committee members are selected based on their scientific expertise, professional experience, and ability to provide informed, objective advice on proposals within the scope of CISE/CCF activities. Membership is drawn from a range of disciplines (*e.g.*, computing, engineering and mathematics) to ensure representation of the scientific areas encompassed by the committee's review portfolio. Members consists of approximately 675 members across all meetings. The subject matter expertise needed and the volume of proposals to be reviewed was used to determine the number of members in any given

meeting. Every effort has been made to ensure balanced membership, including representation across scientific disciplines, institutions, and geographic regions. Members are selected to provide complementary perspectives and the depth of technical expertise necessary to conduct thorough and credible proposal reviews. The majority of committee members are anticipated to be comprised of Special Government Employees (SGEs) with a small percentage of Regular Government Employees (RGEs) when subject matter expertise requires.

4. *List of all other Federal advisory committees of the agency:*

- 84684 Advisory Committee for Technology, Innovation and Partnerships
- 1172 Alan T. Waterman Award Committee
- 13883 Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee
- 1173 Committee on Equal Opportunities in Science and Engineering
- 1186 Proposal Review Panel for Astronomical Sciences
- 10751 Proposal Review Panel for Atmospheric and Geospace Sciences
- 10747 Proposal Review Panel for Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences
- 10743 Proposal Review Panel for Biological Infrastructure
- 1189 Proposal Review Panel for Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental, and Transport Systems
- 1191 Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry
- 1194 Proposal Review Panel for Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation
- 1207 Proposal Review Panel for Computer and Network Systems
- 34558 Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers and Multidisciplinary Activities
- 1185 Proposal Review Panel for Cyberinfrastructure
- 1569 Proposal Review Panel for Earth Sciences
- 1196 Proposal Review Panel for Electrical, Communications, and Cyber Systems
- 44011 Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers in Biological Sciences
- 173 Proposal Review Panel for Engineering Education and Centers
- 10744 Proposal Review Panel for Environmental Biology
- 1756 Proposal Review Panel for Geosciences
- 57 Proposal Review Panel for Graduate Education
- 1200 Proposal Review Panel for Information and Intelligent Systems
- 84685 Proposal Review Panel for Innovation and Technology Ecosystems
- 2469 Proposal Review Panel for Integrative Activities
- 10745 Proposal Review Panel for Integrative Organismal Systems
- 10749 Proposal Review Panel for International Science and Engineering
- 1203 Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research
- 1204 Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical Sciences
- 10746 Proposal Review Panel for Molecular and Cellular Biosciences
- 10752 Proposal Review Panel for Ocean Sciences
- 1208 Proposal Review Panel for Physics
- 1209 Proposal Review Panel for Polar Programs
- 59 Proposal Review Panel for Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings
- 10748 Proposal Review Panel for Social and Economic Sciences
- 1766 Proposal Review Panel for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
- 84683 Proposal Review Panel for Translational Impacts
- 1214 Proposal Review Panel for Undergraduate Education

5. *Justification that the information or advice provided by the Federal advisory committee or subcommittee is not available from another Federal advisory committee, another Federal Government source, or any other more cost-effective and less burdensome source.*

Peer review of proposals is central to NSF processes. Specific advisory committees (*i.e.*, review panels) are impaneled for individual programs to directly provide the specific scientific expertise needed for the proposals under review. Notably, the CISE Directorate supports a wide range of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary activities that include a unique combination of computing, communication foundations, and other scientific expertise that necessitates the recruitment of committee members.

6. *If the consultation is a committee renewal, a summary of the previous accomplishments of the committee and the reasons it needs to continue.*

Past committees have been instrumental in identifying cutting edge topics and projects that pursue bold, innovative research that addresses national needs, strengthens U.S. leadership and fosters advances in new areas of fundamental or applied research, catalyzes development of new

industries or capabilities that increase the leadership position for the country, and/or makes significant progress towards addressing a national need or grand challenge, particularly in current priority areas including, but not limited to, artificial intelligence, bioengineering, quantum engineering, robotics, and nuclear engineering. An example of groundbreaking areas identified by the committees are Artificial Intelligence and Quantum Information Science, both of which have been funded for many years before they became a priority topic at NSF.

7. *Explanation of why the committee/subcommittee is essential to the conduct of agency business.*

The CISE FACA committees are essential to the conduct of agency business as they align with the agency's merit review process and criteria in keeping with 42 U.S. Code § 1862s—“Reaffirmation of merit-based peer review”, which outlines that “the Foundation’s intellectual merit and broader impacts criteria are appropriate for evaluating grant proposals” and directs the Foundation to “maintain the intellectual merit and broader impacts criteria, among other specific criteria as appropriate, as the basis for evaluating grant proposals in the merit review process.”

NSF’s mission as described in the 1950 NSF act, is “to promote the progress of science, advance national health, prosperity, and welfare, and secure the national defense. This is achieved by investing in research to expand knowledge in science, engineering, and education, and by increasing the capacity of the U.S. to conduct and benefit from such research.” Merit review panels under these FACA committees serve as the basis for the gold standard merit review to support the most compelling research to advance the NSF mission.

This public interest determination documents that renewing the committee is in the public interest, essential to the conduct of agency business, and that the information to be obtained is not already available through another advisory committee or source within the Federal Government.

Dated: May 26, 2026.

Crystal Robinson,

Committee Management Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2026–10691 Filed 5–28–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P