

## **Trans-Atlantic Platform Democracy, Governance, and Trust (T-AP DGT) Addendum for Proposals to the National Science Foundation (NSF)**

Note: This addendum contains agency-specific information for U.S.-based institutions submitting proposals for National Science Foundation (NSF) funding in response to the Trans-Atlantic Platform Democracy, Governance, and Trust (T-AP DGT) Call for Proposals. Please see the [T-AP Web site](#) for links to the main Call for Proposals and Addenda for all funders.

Proposals from international teams will initially be submitted through the T-AP DGT online portal hosted by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP). Following panel review and Program Officer deliberations, Principal Investigators (PIs) whose proposals have been recommended for funding through NSF will be asked to submit a copy of the original proposal, plus additional documents required for all NSF proposals, to Research.gov, or Grants.gov.

**Proposers are reminded that in order to be considered for funding from the NSF, proposals must be compliant with NSF's [Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide \(PAPPG; NSF 23-1\)](#), as well as with the T-AP DGT Call for Proposals and this Addendum for Proposals to the NSF.**

### **Program Officer:**

- Kwabena Gyimah-Brempong, Program Director, telephone: 703-292-7466, email: [kgyimahb@nsf.gov](mailto:kgyimahb@nsf.gov).

### **For questions related to the use of Research.gov, contact:**

- Research.gov Help Desk, telephone: 1-800-381-1532
- Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: [rgov@nsf.gov](mailto: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](mailto:support@grants.gov).

### **Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number:**

- 47.075 – Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences

### **I. Program Description**

See T-AP DGT Call for Proposals.

## **Scientific Purview**

Proposals for NSF funding must fit within the scientific purview of the NSF Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE). SBE supports fundamental research on human behavior and social organizations and how social, economic, political, cultural and environmental forces affect the lives of people from birth to old age and how people in turn shape those forces. This includes research that advances scientific knowledge about the brain; human cognition, action and perception; learning and augmented intelligence; linguistics; social psychology; development; and interactions between human societies and their environments. The Directorate also supports research in the anthropological and geographical sciences and on human networks and data science. In addition, SBE seeks to enhance the understanding of individual, social and organizational behavior by creating and sustaining social science infrastructure, and by supporting disciplinary and interdisciplinary research that advances knowledge in sociology; economics; the science of organizations; decision, risk and management sciences; security and preparedness; science and technology studies; secure and trustworthy cyberspace; accountable institutions and behavior; law and science; science of science; and the science of broadening participation.

SBE does not support strictly applied research. Nor does it support technical assistance, pilot plant efforts, research requiring security classification, the development of products for commercial marketing, or market research for a particular project or invention.

Research with disease-related goals, including work on the etiology, diagnosis or treatment of physical or mental disease, abnormality or malfunction in human beings or animals, is normally not supported. Animal models of such conditions or the development or testing of drugs or other procedures for their treatment also are not eligible for support.

Proposers are strongly encouraged to consult [SBE's programs](#) and contact the program officer identified above to discuss their proposals' fit within NSF and SBE's purview prior to submission of the international team proposal to the T-AP DGT Call. Proposals seeking NSF funding that fall outside of NSF or SBE's purview will be returned without review.

## **II. Award Information**

**Anticipated Type of Award:** Standard Grant

**Estimated Number of Awards:** up to 10

**Anticipated Funding Amount:** \$2,000,000

Proposals for NSF funding may request budgets of up to \$200,000 (total costs). The maximum award duration is three years.

Cost Sharing: Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

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

### III. Eligibility

#### Who May Submit Proposals:

The following categories of proposers are eligible to submit proposals to NSF in response to the T-AP DGT Call for Proposals: **Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)** - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the U.S., acting on behalf of their faculty members.

**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.

**State and Local Governments** - State educational offices or organizations and local school districts may submit proposals intended to broaden the impact, accelerate the pace, and increase the effectiveness of improvements in science, mathematics and engineering education in both K-12 and post-secondary levels.

Foreign organizations, for-profit organizations, other U.S. Federal agencies, and unaffiliated individuals (as defined in [Chapter I.E.](#) of NSF 23-1, the PAPPG), are not eligible to submit proposals to NSF in response to the T-AP DGT Call for Proposals.

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

If a proposal involves multiple U.S.-based organizations, it must be submitted as a single proposal with subawards. Separately submitted collaborative proposals are not permitted and will be returned without review.

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

An individual may participate in no more than two T-AP DGT proposals requesting NSF support, but in only one proposal as PI. An individual may participate in two proposals as co-PI or in one proposal as PI and one proposal as co-PI. Should one PI or co-PI not comply with this rule, all proposals that include that PI or co-PI will be returned without review.

### IV. T-AP DGT Proposal and Submission Information: Additional Documents File

The T-AP DGT Call for Proposals provides detailed instructions about the required content and format of the T-AP DGT team proposal. In addition to the Research

Proposal, Requested Budget, and Consent Form, T-AP DGT proposals that request funding from the NSF must include the following items in the Additional Documents File:

**1. Letters of Collaboration from Cooperation Partners:** Letters of collaboration are not letters of reference or endorsement; they should focus solely on affirming that the individual or organization is willing to collaborate on the project as specified in the project description. Each letter of collaboration must be signed by the designated collaborator. See [Chapter II.D.2.d \(iv\) of the PAPPG](#) for further information about the implementation of this requirement and a template for letters of collaboration.

**2. Collaborators & Other Affiliations Information:** Information regarding collaborators and other affiliations (COA) must be separately provided for each individual identified as senior personnel on the NSF portion of the project. The COA information must be provided through use of the [COA template](#). Please see [PAPPG II.D.2.h\(iii\)](#) of the NSF PAPPG additional information about this requirement.

## V. NSF Proposal and Submission Information

As described above, proposals from international teams will initially be submitted through the T-AP DGT online portal. Following panel review and Program Officer deliberations, PIs whose proposals have been recommended for funding through NSF will be asked to submit a copy of the original DGT proposal, plus additional documents required for all NSF proposals, via Research.gov, or Grants.gov.

The list below describes how items required in proposals submitted to NSF relate to those submitted by the international teams through the T-AP DGT portal. **Note that this list is not all inclusive. NSF proposals must conform to all NSF submission requirements, as described in [Chapter II – Proposal Preparation Instructions](#) of the PAPPG.**

### 1. NSF Cover Sheet (additional NSF requirement):

For the Program Announcement/Solicitation select: "NSF 23-1 Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide".

For the Division select: "SMA-SBE Office of Multidisciplinary

Activities". For the Program select: "Trans-Atlantic Platform",

PD 21-188Y.

**2. Project Summary (maximum of one page, additional NSF requirement):** [See PAPPG, Chapter II.D2.b](#). For NSF, the Project Summary must consist of an overview of the project, a statement on the intellectual merit of the proposed activity, and a statement on the broader impacts of the proposed activity. The overview includes a description of the activity that would result if the proposal were funded,

and a statement of objectives and methods to be employed. The statement on intellectual merit should describe the potential of the proposed activity to advance knowledge. The statement on broader impacts should describe the potential of the proposed activity to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes. The Project Summary should be written in the third person, informative to other persons working in the same or related fields, and insofar as possible, understandable to a broad audience within the scientific domain. It should not be an abstract of the proposal.

3. **Table of Contents (required in the T-AP DGT proposal).** The Table of Contents is automatically generated in Research.gov.
4. **Project Description (similar to the Narrative portion of the T-AP DGT proposal; maximum of 12 pages).** See [PAPPG, Chapter II.D.2.d](#). In addition to the components required for the T-AP DGT proposals, for NSF proposals the Project Description must also contain two separate sections that address the intellectual merit and broader impacts of the proposed research. These sections should be labelled “Intellectual Merit” and “Broader Impacts,” respectively. 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. See ([Chapter II.D.2.d.\(i\)](#)) of the PAPPG for additional discussion of broader impacts. The Project Description should also discuss results from any prior (in the last five years) NSF support to the PI or co-PI(s), as described in the [PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.d.iii](#).
5. **References Cited (required in the T-AP DGT proposal).** See [PAPPG, Chapter II.D.2.e](#)
6. **Biographical Sketches (similar to the Résumés portion of the T-AP DGT proposal):** See [PAPPG, Chapter II.D.2.f](#). For NSF, a separate biographical sketch (limited to two pages) must be provided through use of an [NSF-approved format](#), for each individual designated as senior personnel. (See [Exhibit II-3](#) for the definitions of Senior Personnel.)
7. **Budget and Budget Justification (required in the T-AP DGT proposal).** See PAPPG, [Chapter II.D.2.f](#)
8. **Current and Pending Support (additional NSF requirement):** See [PAPPG, Chapter II.D.2.h](#). For NSF, Current and pending support information must be separately provided through use of an [NSF- approved format](#), for each individual designated as senior personnel on the proposal.
9. **Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources (additional NSF requirement, as described in the [PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.g](#)).**
10. **Special Information and Supplementary Documentation.**
  - a. **Data Management Plan (maximum of two pages; required in T-AP DGT**

**proposal)**: Plans for data management and sharing of the products of research, including preservation, documentation, and sharing of data, samples, physical collections, curriculum materials and other related research and education products should be described in the Special Information and Supplementary Documentation section of the proposal (see [Chapter II.D.2.i \(ii\)](#) of the PAPPG for additional instructions for preparation of this section).

- b. Postdoctoral Researcher Mentoring Plan (if funding for postdoctoral researchers is requested; additional NSF requirement)**: Each proposal that requests funding to support postdoctoral researchers must upload under “Mentoring Plan” in the supplementary documentation section of Research.gov, a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided for such individuals. In no more than one page, the mentoring plan must describe the mentoring that will be provided to all postdoctoral researchers supported by the project, regardless of whether they reside at the submitting organization or any subrecipient organization. See [Chapter II.D.2.i \(i\) of the PAPPG](#) for further information about the implementation of this requirement.
- c. Letters of Collaboration (required in the Additional Documents File of the T-AP DGT proposal if Cooperation Partners are named, as described above).**

**11. Collaborators & Other Affiliations Information (required in the T-AP DGT proposal in the Additional Documents File, as described above)**: For the NSF proposal, the [COA template](#) must be saved in .xlsx format and directly uploaded into Research.gov as a Collaborators and Other Affiliations Single Copy Document. Research.gov will convert the uploaded .xlsx files to PDF. For Grants.gov Users, the COA template should be uploaded as a PDF attachment. Please see [Chapter II.D.2.h\(iii\)](#) of the NSF PAPPG additional information about this requirement.

## **VI. Proposal Review**

See T-AP DGT Call for Proposals and below.

### **NSF Merit Review Criteria**

All NSF proposals are evaluated through the use of the two National Science Board (NSB)-approved merit review criteria: intellectual merit and the broader impacts of the proposed activities. Additional review criteria specific to this funding opportunity are described in the T-AP DGT Call for Proposals.

#### **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 III.A.2 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 III.A.2, prior to the review of a proposal.

When evaluating NSF proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they

succeed and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

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

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

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

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

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

### **NSF 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 applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the division director acts upon the program officer's recommendation.

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

Once an award or declination decision has been made, principal investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the principal investigator/project director by the program officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

## **VII. Award Administration**

### **Information**

#### **Notification of the Award**

Notification of the award is made to the submitting organization by a grants officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF program administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will

be provided automatically to the principal investigator.

## **Award Conditions**

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

\*These documents may be accessed electronically on [NSF's award conditions web page](#). Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from [nsfpubs@nsf.gov](mailto: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](#).

## **Reporting Requirements**

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

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

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

summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project. This report will be posted on the NSF website exactly as it is submitted by the PI.

**Special Reporting Requirements:** In addition to the standard NSF reporting requirements described above, and as described in the T-AP DGT Call for Proposals, awardees will also be required to submit a white paper, which will be due within 90 days after the end of the award period. This white paper should document the project, including lessons learned, so that others can benefit. This white paper will be posted on the T-AP website.

## VIII. Other Information

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

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

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

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the

United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

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

- **Location:**
  - 2415 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22314
- **For General Information (NSF Information Center)**
  - (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):**
  - (703) 292-5090
- **To Order Publications or Forms:**
  - Send an e-mail to [nsfpubs@nsf.gov](mailto: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 awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding applicants or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party.

Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See [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  
Office of the General Counsel  
National Science Foundation  
Alexandria, VA 22314