experience. The breadth of expertise required for fair peer evaluation of the variety of proposals received transcends the ability of NSF staff, so outside advice from scientists from all polar disciplines is essential. Panel review is the only viable means to obtain adequate review of proposals in these varied programs.

*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
1192 Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations
1185 Proposal Review Panel for Cyberinfrastructure
1569 Proposal Review Panel for Earth Sciences
1196 Proposal Revew 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
34558 Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers and Multidisciplinary Activities
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.*

Polar Programs proposal review panels cannot be replaced by existing panels or advisory committees due to the highly specialized and interdisciplinary nature of polar science, the small and interconnected research community with elevated conflict-of-interest risk, and the tight coupling of scientific merit with constrained logistics resources. In Arctic contexts, the inclusion of social science perspectives introduces additional considerations related to community engagement and coordination alongside field-based science campaigns. Collectively, these factors preclude reliance on standing advisory bodies and require competition-specific panels to ensure independent, expert evaluation and compliance with NSF's statutory merit review requirements.

*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 Polar Science panels have delivered significant value by strengthening the quality, consistency, and credibility of NSF funding recommendations through rigorous, independent merit review; advancing interdisciplinary Earth system science across atmosphere, ocean, ice, and ecosystems; informing the prioritization and execution of high-cost, logistically complex field campaigns in the Arctic and Antarctic; and reinforcing workforce development across the research community. These accomplishments have been particularly important given the strategic importance of the polar regions, enabling U.S. leadership in polar science, advancing data-intensive and emerging research areas, and ensuring that NSF investments continue to produce impactful and nationally relevant scientific outcomes in alignment with administration priorities.

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

Panel deliberations and subsequent advice is essential to upholding gold-standard merit review which inform NSF staff funding recommendations.

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. 2026–10699 Filed 5–28–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Proposal Review Panel for Computer and Network Systems; 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 Computer and Network Systems.

**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 Computer and Network Systems, #1207

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:* $443,076.

*a. Federal personnel on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis:* 6 FTE.

*b. Other Federal internal costs:* $7200.

*c. Proposed payments to members:* $425,971.

*d. Proposed number of members:* 740.

*e. Reimbursable costs:* $9,905.

*2. If applicable, the total dollar value of grants expected to be recommended during the fiscal year:* $167,690,318.

*3. Criteria for selecting members to ensure the committee has the necessary.*

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 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 740 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
34558 Proposal Review Panel for Emerging Frontiers and Multidisciplinary Activities
1192 Proposal Review Panel for Computing & Communication Foundations
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.*

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.

*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 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. 2026–10697 Filed 5–28–26; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555–01–P**

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Proposal Review Panel for Engineering Education and Centers; Committee Renewal

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Committee Management Renewal.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is renewing the committee for Graduate Education.

**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 Engineering Education and Centers, #173

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:* $416,412.

*a. Federal personnel on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis:* 3.9 FTE.

*b. Other Federal internal costs:* $2,088.

*c. Proposed payments to members:* $378,086.

*d. Proposed number of members:* 603.

*e. Reimbursable costs:* $36,238.

*2. If applicable, the total dollar value of grants expected to be recommended during the fiscal year:* $65,228,747.

*3. Criteria for selecting members to ensure the committee has the necessary.*

Committee members are selected based on their scientific and technical expertise, professional experience, and ability to provide informed, objective advice on proposals within the scope of EEC activities. Membership is drawn from a broad range of disciplines to ensure representation of the scientific areas encompassed by the committee's review portfolio. Membership consists of approximately 603 members considering all meetings. The subject matter and volume of proposals to be reviewed determine the number of members participating in any given meeting. Every effort is 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