



U.S. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
2415 EISENHOWER AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

NSF 25-020

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for the Division of Earth Sciences (EAR) Realignment

1. Why did the Division of Earth Sciences (EAR) realign its science funding programs?
2. What happened to my program?
3. I currently have a proposal under review in an EAR program, but now that program has been archived. What happens to that proposal?
4. How does this program realignment impact my existing award?
5. Now that there are new programs, do I still need to submit my annual and final reports?
6. How do I determine which new program is the best fit for my research idea?
7. What is the estimated budget for the new programs and how many awards are anticipated each year?
8. Are funding rates and award budgets going to stay constant with the new programs?
9. What is the best e-mail address to use to contact the Program Directors in my new program?
10. Should I change how I write proposals in response to this realignment?
11. Will EAR continue to consider EAGER, RAPID, and Conference proposals?
12. Will proposals still be co-reviewed within EAR and how do I request a co-review between programs?
13. What has happened to the Instrumentation and Facilities and Geoinformatics programs during this realignment?
14. How do I handle the resubmission of a previous proposal?
15. Does the EAR realignment affect the number of proposals a PI can submit to one or more programs in a year?
16. What's the difference between the EAR-solicitation-required Field Safety Protocol and

1. Why did the Division of Earth Sciences (EAR) realign its science funding programs?

EAR realigned its science funding programs to better serve the research community. The nature of EAR-supported science is changing, with more projects that span multiple domains of Earth Science research. By having programs with broader scopes, EAR is making it simpler to find a home for a given research project. The realignment of programs is designed to more readily support disciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary science. The new programmatic structure also will provide greater flexibility for EAR to support projects encompassing a wider range of award sizes and scopes.

2. What happened to my program?

While the EAR programs have changed names and structure, the disciplines that the division supports have not changed.

3. I currently have a proposal under review in an EAR program, but now that program has been archived. What happens to that proposal?

Your proposal is still under review and will be reviewed according to the solicitation to which it was submitted. If you have specific questions about your pending proposal, please contact the cognizant Program Director.

4. How does this program realignment impact my existing award?

The realignment does not impact existing awards – you will still work with your cognizant Program Director for issues related to that award.

5. Now that there are new programs, do I still need to submit my annual and final reports?

Yes, this is a requirement of the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG). The realignment does not impact existing awards – you will still work with your cognizant Program Director for anything relating to that award.

6. How do I determine which new program is the best fit for my research idea?

Each solicitation contains a description of the research areas that it supports. PIs should

review the solicitations to see which program best aligns with the scope of their research:

- Chemical Evolution of the Solid Earth and Volcanology (CESEV)
- Life and Environments through Time (LET)
- Structure and Physics of the Solid Earth (SPSE)
- Water, Landscape, and Critical Zone Processes (WaLCZ)

If PIs are still unclear which program offers the optimal programmatic fit, then they should contact program directors in the relevant programs for additional feedback. Contact information for all programs can be found on their respective program web pages.

7. What is the estimated budget for the new programs and how many awards are anticipated each year?

The new program solicitations provide an estimate of the programs' annual budgets and number of awards. If you are not sure whether the program can support the scope and budget of your proposal, you should reach out to the program directors for guidance.

8. Are funding rates and award budgets going to stay constant with the new programs?

Funding rates and award budgets are dependent upon the number of proposals submitted to the program each year and appropriations provided to NSF. Please check the individual solicitations for the estimated budgets and number of awards.

9. What is the best e-mail address to use to contact the Program Directors in my new program?

Each program provides contact information on the program website:

- Chemical Evolution of the Solid Earth and Volcanology (CESEV)
- Life and Environments through Time (LET)
- Structure and Physics of the Solid Earth (SPSE)
- Water, Landscape, and Critical Zone Processes (WaLCZ)

10. Should I change how I write proposals in response to this realignment?

Proposal preparation requirements for some programs have changed. Be sure to read the solicitations' Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions.

11. Will EAR continue to consider EAGER, RAPID, and Conference proposals?

Yes. Refer to the solicitations and most current PAPPG for guidance on these proposal

types.

12. Will proposals still be co-reviewed within EAR and how do I request a co-review between programs?

Yes, in cases where the scientific scope of a proposal overlaps that of two or more programs, EAR will continue to employ co-review. When creating the proposal, the PI can indicate which programs should consider co-review. Additionally, the PI may contact the programs and indicate possible programs for co-review. The cognizant program director independently may also initiate co-review after reviewing a proposal's scope.

13. What has happened to the Instrumentation and Facilities and Geoinformatics programs during this realignment?

These research support programs, and their related solicitations, are continuing in their current forms.

14. How do I handle the resubmission of a previous proposal?

All proposals submitted to NSF are treated as new submissions. To determine the best program fit for your proposal, please read the solicitations. For further questions, please consult the Program Director of the original program or archived solicitation.

15. Does the EAR realignment affect the number of proposals a PI can submit to one or more programs in a year?

No, not at this time.

16. What's the difference between the EAR-solicitation-required Field Safety Protocol and the PAPPG-required plan for Safe and Inclusive Working Environments for Off-Campus or Off-Site Research?

All new EAR science programs require a Field Safety Protocol to be submitted with proposals that have a field component. Field Safety Protocols should address potential hazards and risks of the field areas in the proposed work, e.g., dangerous, remote, or unpredictable conditions; societal discrimination; U.S. State Department Travel Advisories; and participants who may not have experience working under conditions that can be, at times, uncomfortable, unfamiliar, or threatening. These protocols are reviewed by the program as part of the Broader Impacts criterion. The Field Safety Protocol should be uploaded as a 1-page document in the Special Information & Supplementary Documents section.

This Protocol is separate from, and in addition to, the certification for "Safe and Inclusive Working Environments for Off-Campus or Off-Site Research." Instructions regarding the

required plan for Safe and Inclusive Working Environments can be found in Chapter II.E.9 the PAPPG. That plan should describe how the following types of behavior will be addressed: A) Abuse of any person, including, but not limited to, harassment, stalking, bullying, or hazing of any kind, whether the behavior is carried out verbally, physically, electronically, or in written form; or B) Conduct that is unwelcome, offensive, indecent, obscene, or disorderly. Unlike the EAR-required Field Safety Protocol, proposers should not submit the plan for Safe and Inclusive Working Environments to NSF for review.