

NSF 25-512: NSF Boosting Research Ideas for Transformative and Equitable Advances in Engineering (BRITE)

Program Solicitation

Document Information

Document History

- **Posted:** November 25, 2024
- **Replaces:** [NSF 23-592](#)

[View the program page](#)



U.S. National Science Foundation

Directorate for Engineering

Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation

Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

March 03, 2025



Table Of Contents

[Summary of Program Requirements](#)

[I. Introduction](#)

[II. Program Description](#)

[III. Award Information](#)

[IV. Eligibility Information](#)

[V. Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions](#)

[A. Proposal Preparation Instructions](#)

[B. Budgetary Information](#)

[C. Due Dates](#)

[D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements](#)

VI. NSF Proposal Processing and Review Procedures

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

B. Review and Selection Process

VII. Award Administration Information

A. Notification of the Award

B. Award Conditions

C. Reporting Requirements

VIII. Agency Contacts

IX. Other Information

Important Information And Revision Notes

- The Fellow Track is removed. The solicitation now contains two tracks: Pivot and Relaunch.
- NSF will hold an information webinar:

When: January 6, 2025 at 02:00-3:15 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: BRITE FY25 Solicitation Information Webinar Register in advance for the webinars at:

https://nsf.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_XuijDOcGTNCS1mQw8otlzA 

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) that is in effect for the relevant due date to which the proposal is being submitted. The NSF PAPPG is regularly revised and it is the responsibility of the proposer to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements specified in this solicitation and the applicable version of the PAPPG. Submitting a proposal prior to a specified deadline does not negate this requirement.

Summary Of Program Requirements

General Information

Program Title:

NSF Boosting Research Ideas for Transformative and Equitable Advances in Engineering (BRITE)

Synopsis of Program:

The National Science Foundation's strategic goals are to expand knowledge and build capacity for a diverse science and engineering workforce¹, consistent with NSF's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in all science and engineering fields and research endeavors, as well as with US Government priorities^{2, 3}. This solicitation seeks proposals that enable experienced researchers with active research programs to take risks not typically associated with proposals submitted to core programs by pivoting to research areas where they have no proven track record or gaining knowledge from a different discipline and using it to forge new directions in their research field, or enter a new field; or experienced researchers with a hiatus in research activity to reestablish a foundation for sustained research productivity and broader impacts^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}. It is grounded in the expectation that leveraging prior science and engineering outcomes, harnessing talent from the broad scientific research community, enabling time for reflection and deliberation, including by learning new skills and through immersion in new areas, and supporting intellectual risk taking will lead to scientific and technological innovation.

All BRITE proposals are expected to address fundamental research that creates new knowledge in one or more program areas of the [Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation \(CMMI\)](#). BRITE proposals must identify key research outcomes and describe the research plans for the period of funding sought. Although collaborative proposals are not permitted and will be returned without review, the PI can include a collaborator as senior personnel. The role of such senior personnel should be limited to reflect the intended investment in the PI.

The solicitation includes two funding tracks in support of experienced scientists and engineers (tenured or equivalent): Pivot and Relaunch.

- The BRITE **Pivot Track** is intended to enable researchers to quickly adapt to the fast-moving pace of research by either leveraging their experience when pursuing a pivot into a field of research where they have no proven track record, or by incorporating research tools and methodologies from other fields of research to advance knowledge in their areas of expertise.
- The BRITE **Relaunch Track** is intended to enable researchers who have had a hiatus in research activity to relaunch back into active research by reestablishing a foundation for sustained productivity and broader impacts in the context of a research idea with significant potential for advancing knowledge.

PIs are strongly encouraged to contact a cognizant Program Officer to assess the responsiveness of their ideas to the BRITE solicitation prior to submission. Proposals that are outside the bounds of CMMI program areas will be returned without review. All funded projects will form an NSF BRITE cohort and investigators will be required to attend an annual PI meeting and may be invited to other activities.

The expected funding ranges for BRITE awards are:

\$100,000 - \$200,000 per year

The award duration is 3 years for all BRITE awards. The duration and total funding level of all BRITE awards must not exceed 36 months and \$600,000, respectively.

BRITE proposals responding to this solicitation must include five sections within the 15-page Project Description with the following section headings: Past Contributions, Research Approach and Research Plan, Track Relevance, Outcomes, and Broadening Participation Plan. Please see "Full Proposal Preparation Instructions" for additional details.

Broadening Participation In STEM

NSF recognizes the unique lived experiences of individuals from communities that are underrepresented and/or under-served in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and the barriers to inclusion and access to STEM education and careers. NSF highly encourages the leadership, partnership, and contributions in all NSF opportunities of individuals who are members of such communities supported by NSF. This includes leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding; serving as peer reviewers, advisory committee members, and/or committee of visitor members; and serving as NSF leadership, program, and/or administrative staff. NSF also highly encourages demographically diverse institutions of higher education (IHEs) to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities on behalf of their research and education communities. NSF expects that all individuals, including those who are members of groups that are underrepresented and/or under-served in STEM, are treated equitably and inclusively in the Foundation's proposal and award process.

NSF encourages IHEs that enroll, educate, graduate, and employ individuals who are members of groups underrepresented and/or under-served in STEM education programs and careers to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities, including leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding. Such IHEs include, but may not be limited to, community colleges and two-year institutions, mission-based institutions such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), women's colleges, and institutions that

primarily serve persons with disabilities, as well as institutions defined by enrollment such as Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs), Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs), and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs).

"Broadening participation in STEM" is the comprehensive phrase used by NSF to refer to the Foundation's goal of increasing the representation and diversity of individuals, organizations, and geographic regions that contribute to STEM teaching, research, and innovation. To broaden participation in STEM, it is necessary to address issues of equity, inclusion, and access in STEM education, training, and careers. Whereas all NSF programs might support broadening participation components, some programs primarily focus on supporting broadening participation research and projects. Examples can be found on the NSF [Broadening Participation in STEM](#) website.

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.

- Giovanna Biscontin, telephone: (703) 292-2339, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Marcello Canova, telephone: (703) 292-2576, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Khershed P. Cooper, telephone: (703) 292-7017, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Siddiq M. Qidwai, Team Lead, telephone: (703) 292-2211, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Shivani Sharma, telephone: (703) 292-4204, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Yue Wang, telephone: (703) 292-4588, email: BRITE@nsf.gov

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

- 47.041 --- Engineering

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant or Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 12

Pivot – about 7 awards

Relaunch – about 5 awards

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$7,000,000

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

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 sub-awards 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 laboratories, professional societies and similar organizations located in the U.S. that are directly

associated with educational or research activities.

Who May Serve as PI:

The PI must hold a tenured faculty appointment at the Associate/Full Professor rank or equivalent at an organization that is eligible to submit as described under "Who May Submit Proposals." Co-PIs are not allowed on any of the tracks. Separately submitted collaborative proposals are not allowed.

Principal Investigators are limited to one active BRITE award at a time.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI: 1

An individual may serve as PI on only one BRITE proposal. This limitation does not include receiving a sub-award as part of another BRITE proposal. Co-PIs are not allowed on any of the tracks. There are no restrictions or limits on serving as Other Senior/Key Personnel.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Not required
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required
- **Full Proposals:**
 - Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG)* guidelines apply. 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.
 - Full Proposals submitted via Grants.gov: *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov* guidelines apply (Note: 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).

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.
- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**

Not Applicable
- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

Other budgetary limitations apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

March 03, 2025

Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:

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

Award Administration Information**Award Conditions:**

Additional award conditions apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

Reporting Requirements:

Standard NSF reporting requirements apply.

I. Introduction

This solicitation seeks proposals that enable experienced researchers with active research programs to take risks not typically associated with proposals submitted to core programs by pivoting to research areas where they have no proven track record, gaining knowledge from a different discipline and using it to forge new directions in their research field or entering a new field, or experienced researchers with a hiatus in research activity to reestablish a foundation for sustained research productivity and broader impacts [4-10]. This solicitation invites proposals from the broad spectrum of the highly skilled scientific workforce in engineering fields that NSF's [Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation \(CMMI\)](#) supports to ensure diversity of thought in innovation¹. BRITE PIs will actively engage in advancing their fields, serving as mentors and role models for STEM students, and serving the nation in addressing current and future real-world challenges.

This 2025 NSF BRITE solicitation consists of two tracks:

BRITE Pivot Track

BRITE Relaunch Track

NSF is committed to research and development that derives expertise from and provides broad benefits to a diverse public. The underrepresentation of many groups in science and engineering deprives large segments of the population the opportunity to be creators of research and technology and deprives the scientific enterprise of their potential contributions. The program encourages the participation of the full spectrum of diverse talents in STEM.

II. Program Description

The guiding rationale of the NSF CMMI BRITE funding opportunity is that leveraging prior science and engineering outcomes, harnessing talent from the broad scientific research community, enabling time for reflection and deliberation, including by learning new skills and through immersion in new areas, and supporting intellectual risk taking will lead to scientific and technological innovation.

The goals of this solicitation will be accomplished through 2 tracks: BRITE Pivot and BRITE Relaunch. A proposal submitted to either of the two tracks will be a research proposal that advances the field, with strong intellectual merit and broader impacts as determined by external review in accordance with the standard NSF review criteria and procedures, as well as additional solicitation-specific criteria. Proposals submitted in response to this solicitation must include sections on how the proposal aligns with the selected track, the research approach and research plan, and a description of the intended scientific outcomes and broader impacts of the research activities. The principal investigator may choose to seek a stimulating environment through sabbatical or other leave outside of their academic institution, which may include spending time at another institution, industry, organization, or national lab. Note that while this type of activity is permitted, it is not required.

This NSF BRITE solicitation supports research that aligns with one or more of the CMMI program areas. *Proposals that are outside the bounds of CMMI program areas will be returned without review.*

BRITE proposals should be distinguishable from typical unsolicited proposals to core programs. Proposals submitted to the Pivot track should enable PIs to take risks associated with pivoting to research areas where they have no proven track record or gaining knowledge from a different discipline and using it to forge new directions in their research field. Proposals submitted to the Relaunch track should enable PIs with a hiatus in research activity to reestablish a foundation for sustained research productivity and broader impacts.

PIs are strongly encouraged to contact a cognizant Program Officer to assess the responsiveness of their ideas with the BRITE solicitation prior to submission by emailing a one-page project summary to BRITE@nsf.gov prior to submission.

TRACKS

Pivot track: The BRITE Pivot track is intended to enable researchers to quickly adapt to the fast-moving pace of research by either leveraging their experience when pursuing a pivot into a field of research where they have no proven track record, or by incorporating research tools and methodologies from other fields of research to advance knowledge in their areas of expertise. Proposals submitted to the Pivot track should enable PIs to take risks not usually associated with proposals submitted to core programs by emphasizing the originality of the pivot to both the PI and the relevant research community, as well as the potential for transformative impact.

In many fields of engineering, the research landscape is evolving and progressing at an unprecedented pace. The priorities, research trends, and state-of-the-art in a given field are likely to be very different than those at the beginning of the careers of many established researchers. Similarly, research tools and methodologies for conducting experimental or computational research are rapidly changing and growing in numbers. By enabling PIs to translate expertise in one field to impact in another, the Pivot track facilitates an expansion of the cumulative capabilities of the nation's STEM workforce to tackle complex interdisciplinary problems with outcomes of broad societal value.

Relaunch track: The BRITE Relaunch track is intended to enable researchers who have had a hiatus in research activity to relaunch back into active research by reestablishing a foundation for sustained productivity and broader impacts in the context of a research idea with significant potential for advancing knowledge. Proposals submitted to the Relaunch track should describe how the proposed foundation is designed to propel the PI back into active research that is sustained also at the conclusion of the award period, for example, by enabling the PI to become current with state-of-the-art research, attend research-intensive workshops and short courses, establish collaborative networks, participate in professional community activities, or learn best practices for mentoring and societal impact.

Many circumstances, including but not limited to a non-traditional career path in academia, a significant personal/family event, or a period of heavy teaching or service to an institution or for the community, may result in a hiatus in research activity. By enabling PIs to relaunch back into active research, the Relaunch track invests in a diversification of experiences of the nation's STEM researchers and ensures that their talents can be maximally harnessed.

For purposes of this solicitation, hiatus in research activity means an extended period without substantial external funding and/or without substantial peer-reviewed publications. The PI should provide a clear description in the track relevance section of the impacts of the hiatus situation, highlighting the PI's trajectory and achievements prior to the hiatus. *A justification of the hiatus should not be included and will not be considered during review.*

REFERENCES

¹ *Leading the World in Discovery and Innovation, STEM Talent Development and the Delivery of Benefits from Research: NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2022-2026.* https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=nsf22068.


² Charting a Course for Success: America's Strategy for STEM Education. A Report by the Committee on STEM Education of the National Science & Technology Council. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED590474.pdf>.

³ FACT SHEET: Biden Harris Administration Announces Bold Multi-Sector Actions to Eliminate Systemic Barriers in STEM. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/news-updates/2022/12/12/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-announces-bold->

[multi-sector-actions-to-eliminate-systemic-barriers-in-stemm/](#).

⁴ Mathews, K. R. 2014. Perspectives on Midcareer Faculty and Advice for Supporting Them. Cambridge, MA: The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education.

http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/kmathews/files/coache_mathews_midcareerfaculty_20140721.pdf .

⁵ Eagan, M.K., Jr., and J. C. Garvey. 2015. Stressing Out: Connecting Race, Gender, and Stress with Faculty Productivity. The Journal of Higher Education 86:923-954. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2015.11777389> .

⁶ O'Meara, K., C. J. Lennartz, A. Kuvaeva, A. Jaeger, and J. Misra. 2019. Department Conditions and Practices Associated with Faculty Workload Satisfaction and Perceptions of Equity. The Journal of Higher Education 90:744-772.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1584025> .

⁷ National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). 2021. Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering. NSF 21-321. Alexandria, VA: National Science Foundation. Available at

<https://ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf21321/>.

⁸ Huang, J., A. J. Gates, R. Sinatra, and A-L. Barabasi. 2020. Historical comparison of gender inequality in scientific careers across countries and disciplines. Proceedings of the National Academies of Sciences Feb 2020, 201914221.

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1914221117> .

⁹ Misra, J., J. H. Lundquist, E. Holmes, and S. Agiomavritis. 2011. The ivory ceiling of service work. Academe 97:22-26.

<https://www.aaup.org/article/ivory-ceiling-service-work#.Xim9Ei3MxTY> .

¹⁰ O'Meara, K., A. Kuvaeva, G. Nyunt, C. Waugaman, and R. Jackson. 2017. Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them. American Educational Research Journal 54:1154-1186.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217716767> .

III. Award Information

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

Anticipated funding is \$7,000,000, pending availability of funds to support approximately 12 awards in FY2025.

BRITE Pivot and Relaunch track proposals are eligible for 3 years of funding. The duration and total funding level of all BRITE awards must not exceed 36 months and \$600,000, respectively.

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 sub-awards 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 laboratories, professional societies and similar organizations located in the U.S. that are directly associated with educational or research activities.

Who May Serve as PI:

The PI must hold a tenured faculty appointment at the Associate/Full Professor rank or equivalent at an organization that is eligible to submit as described under "Who May Submit Proposals." Co-PIs are not allowed on any of the tracks. Separately submitted collaborative proposals are not allowed.

Principal Investigators are limited to one active BRITE award at a time.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI: 1

An individual may serve as PI on only one BRITE proposal. This limitation does not include receiving a sub-award as part of another BRITE proposal. Co-PIs are not allowed on any of the tracks. There are no restrictions or limits on serving as Other Senior/Key Personnel.

Additional Eligibility Info:

Principal investigators must hold a tenured faculty appointment at the Associate/Full Professor rank or equivalent to submit to any one of the tracks. This will be certified in a letter from the investigator's department head according to a provided template that must be uploaded as a supplementary document.

A significant commitment of PI time is expected for all tracks.

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 Research.gov or Grants.gov.

- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and 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) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.
- 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) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

See PAPPG Chapter II.D.2 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.

Proposals involving multiple organizations may only be submitted from a lead organization with other collaborating organizations included as sub-awardees. Separately submitted collaborative proposals are not allowed.

Proposal Title:

The title of the proposal must begin with "BRITE" followed by the track identifier (Pivot or Relaunch) followed by a colon. The rest of the title of the proposal should describe the project in concise, informative language, without use of acronyms, so that a technically literate reader can understand what the project is about. The title should emphasize the science and engineering work to be undertaken and be suitable for use in the public press.

Project Description:

Full proposals must follow the PAPPG guidelines for the Project Description. The Project Description must include five solicitation-specific subsections with the following headings: Past Contributions, Research Approach and Research Plan, Track Relevance, Outcomes, and Broadening Participation Plan, with levels of detail to match the selected track. *Proposals that do not include the solicitation-specific subsection with headings as described here will be returned without review.*

The solicitation-specific subsections are in addition to the requirements specified in the PAPPG (separate sections labeled "Broader Impacts" and "Results from Prior NSF support"). The Project Description must not exceed the 15-page limit. See section VI, Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria for more detail.

The Project Description should provide a clear statement of the work to be undertaken and must include the objectives for the period of the proposed research and expected significance. Proposals should discuss 1) objectives and significance of the proposed activity; 2) the suitability of the methods to be used; 3) the qualifications of the investigator; and 4) the ability of the effort to produce outcomes aligned with one of the tracks in this solicitation.

In addition to the requirements of the PAPPG, the project description must include the following five sections with separately labeled headings as indicated:

Past Contributions: In this section, investigators should provide context for their most significant prior contributions to the advancement of knowledge (intellectual merit) and achievement of desired societal outcomes (broader impacts) taken from anywhere along the span of their professional careers and as appropriate for the selected track. This discussion is not limited to the recent past and should not refer to, or provide justification for, any hiatus in research activity if applicable.

Research Approach and Research Plan: In this section, investigators should summarize the state-of-the-art of the field and or impact areas, describe what is innovative about the proposed approach, and describe the technical research activities to be undertaken. This section should describe how the research will lead to advances in one or more CMMI thrust areas.

Activities aimed only at development of a product or instrumentation are not responsive to this solicitation. If proposed, they must be accompanied by activities that will lead to new scientific knowledge.

Track Relevance: In this section, investigators should discuss the alignment between the proposed project goals and activities and the selected track, and explain how their proposal is distinguishable from typical unsolicited proposals to core programs.

Proposals submitted to the Pivot track should enable PIs to take risks associated with pivoting to research areas where they have no proven track record or gaining knowledge from a different discipline and using it to forge new directions in their research field. Proposals submitted to the Relaunch track should enable PIs with a hiatus in research activity to reestablish a foundation for sustained research productivity and broader impacts.

Outcomes: In this section, investigators should identify the expected project outcomes, including advancement of knowledge and benefits to society, as appropriate.

Outcomes associated with proposals submitted to the Pivot track should demonstrate advancement of knowledge achieved by leveraging prior experience to the benefit of a field of research new to the PI or by incorporating tools and methodologies from other fields of research in the PI's area of expertise.

Outcomes associated with proposals submitted to the Relaunch track should be relevant to the reestablishment of a foundation for sustained research productivity and broader impacts.

Broadening Participation Plan: In this section, investigators should describe a plan for activities that will be undertaken to provide equitable access to the project's research efforts and outcomes and/or build an inclusive research and education community. The proposed activities should be informed by already established best practices and related evidence. As BRITE awards are single-investigator projects, the scope is expected to lie within the bounds of an individual effort.

More information about NSF's commitment to broadening participation can be found at the following link: <https://new.nsf.gov/funding/initiatives/broadening-participation>.

Supplementary Documents:

The proposal should include applicable supplementary documents as instructed in the PAPPG. The following items are to be provided as additional supplementary documents.

Department Head Letter: A letter from the PI's department head certifying the PI's eligibility and the department's concurrence with the PI's proposed plan must be uploaded as a supplementary document and contain **only** the text provided below:

"This letter certifies that the PI is a tenured professor (or equivalent) in Department XX and eligible to participate in the BRITE solicitation. The department is in concurrence with the applicant's research and education activities as described in their project description."

List of Project Personnel: Each proposal must include a table that lists the PI, all Senior/Key Personnel, and any other project collaborators. This table should list the following information for each individual in separate columns: Last Name; First Name, Middle Initial; Organizational Affiliation. There is no limit on the number of Senior/Key Personnel, but their role should be limited to reflect the intended investment in the PI. **This personnel table is in addition to the Collaborators and Other Affiliations Information that is required for all Senior/Key Personnel.** *NSF staff will use this information in the merit review process to manage reviewer selection.*

Letters of Collaboration: Any substantial collaboration with individuals not included in the budget should be described in the Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources section of the proposal and documented in a letter of collaboration from each collaborator. Letters of collaboration should not contain endorsements or evaluation of the proposed project.

Investigators are permitted to include one detailed letter of collaboration up to two pages long. All other letters of collaboration must follow the PAPPG recommended format of 2 sentences. *Please note that letters of recommendation for the PI or other letters of support for the project are not permitted.*

Mentoring Plan: (*up to one page*) In some cases, postdoctoral researcher involvement might be justified. Significant rationale should be provided in the Project Description if such involvement is intended. As described in the Chapter II.D.2 of the PAPPG, each proposal that requests funding to support postdoctoral researchers or graduate students must upload a "Mentoring Plan" as a supplementary document. Such a plan should describe the mentoring activities that will be provided for the postdoctoral researcher or graduate students.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:

Proposals should include a three-year budget.

Budgets for all projects must include funding for the PI to attend the annual PI meeting, which may be virtual or in the Washington, DC, area.

Because a **significant commitment of PI time is expected, PIs may request more than two months of salary support**. PAPPG Chapter II.D.2 contains NSF's Senior Personnel Salaries & Wages Policy. If anticipated, compensation for the PI in excess of two months must be disclosed in the proposal budget, justified in the budget justification, and specifically approved by NSF in the award notice budget. Any compensation for other Senior/Key Personnel must be disclosed in the proposal budget, justified in the budget justification, and reflect a limited role.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

March 03, 2025

D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via Research.gov:

To prepare and submit a proposal via Research.gov, see detailed technical instructions available at: https://www.research.gov/research-portal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Service/Desktop/ProposalPreparation For Research.gov user support, call the Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-381-1532 or e-mail rgov@nsf.gov. The Research.gov Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the Research.gov 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 web page: <https://www.grants.gov/applicants>. 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 Research.gov for further processing.

The NSF [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov informational page](#) provides submission guidance to applicants and links to helpful resources including the NSF [Grants.gov Application Guide](#), [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov how-to guide](#), and [Grants.gov Submitted Proposals Frequently Asked Questions](#). Grants.gov proposals must pass all NSF pre-check and post-check validations in order to be accepted by Research.gov at NSF.

When submitting via Grants.gov, NSF strongly recommends applicants initiate proposal submission at least five business days in advance of a deadline to allow adequate time to address NSF compliance errors and resubmissions by 5:00 p.m. submitting organization's local time on the deadline. Please note that some errors cannot be corrected in Grants.gov. Once a proposal passes pre-checks but fails any post-check, an applicant can only correct and submit the in-progress proposal in Research.gov.

Proposers that submitted via Research.gov may use Research.gov 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 acknowledgment 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 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 [Leading the World in Discovery and Innovation, STEM Talent Development and the Delivery of Benefits from Research - NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years \(FY\) 2022 - 2026](#). 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.D.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.D.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 other underrepresented groups 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 and Sharing Plan and the Mentoring Plan, as appropriate.

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

In addition to the above criteria, reviewers will be asked to address the following questions:

- Merit of Past Contributions
 - To what extent do the proposed activities leverage the PI's prior research contributions to the advancement of knowledge and achievement of desired societal outcomes as appropriate for the target track?
- Track Relevance
 - What is the potential for the proposed activities to achieve outcomes consistent with the selected track?
- Risk Assessment
 - For the Pivot track, to what extent do the proposed activities enable the PI to take risks not usually associated with proposals submitted to core programs?
- Broadening Participation Plan
 - To what extent does the project include an authentic plan for the PI to foster broadening participation in research and education in the local academic and/or broader community?

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 generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

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 proposers whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new recipients 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 or the Division of Acquisition and Cooperative Support 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 an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer. 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)*; 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) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the NSF *Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Build America, Buy America

As expressed in Executive Order 14005, [Ensuring the Future is Made in All of America by All of America's Workers](#) (86 FR 7475), it is the policy of the executive branch to use terms and conditions of Federal financial assistance awards to maximize, consistent with law, the use of goods, products, and materials produced in, and services offered in, the United States.

Consistent with the requirements of the Build America, Buy America Act (Pub. L. 117-58, Division G, Title IX, Subtitle A, November 15, 2021), no funding made available through this funding opportunity may be obligated for infrastructure

projects under an award unless all iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in the project are produced in the United States. For additional information, visit NSF's [Build America, Buy America](#) web page

Special Award Conditions:

PIs will be required to attend an annual PI meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to assess progress the awardees have made towards advancing project goals. PIs must include reasonable travel funds in the proposed budgets for this meeting.

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 annual project report, and a project outcomes report for the general public.

Failure to provide the required annual or final annual 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 annual 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.

More comprehensive information on NSF Reporting Requirements and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

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:

- Giovanna Biscontin, telephone: (703) 292-2339, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Marcello Canova, telephone: (703) 292-2576, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Khershed P. Cooper, telephone: (703) 292-7017, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Siddiq M. Qidwai, Team Lead, telephone: (703) 292-2211, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Shivani Sharma, telephone: (703) 292-4204, email: BRITE@nsf.gov
- Yue Wang, telephone: (703) 292-4588, email: BRITE@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of NSF systems contact:

- NSF Help Desk: 1-800-381-1532
- [Research.gov](#) Help Desk e-mail: rgov@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 <https://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.F.7 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) 292-8134
- **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 proposers 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/recipients 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 proposers 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 [System of Record Notices, NSF-50](#), "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," and [NSF-51](#), "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records." 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
 Policy Office, Division of Institution and Award Support
 Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management
 National Science Foundation
 Alexandria, VA 22314

[Vulnerability disclosure](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [Privacy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [No FEAR Act](#) | [USA.gov](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Plain language](#) |



National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria, VA 22314
 Tel: (703) 292-5111,

