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PRIVATE MINUTES

The panel “AF CAREER/CRII Panel A” convened at the National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA in a closed session starting on October 23, 2017 to review and evaluate 31 proposals (31 projects). The proposals were submitted in response to the Computer and Information Science and Engineering (CISE) Computing and Communication Foundation Computing and Communication Foundations (CCF): Core Programs, NSF 17-571. The panel location was W2190.

Panel composition: 10 panel members participated in person. 4 panel members participated by teleconference. The names of the panelists are not being released to protect the confidentiality of those who reviewed particular proposals, since individual identities of panelists could be inferred from the area of specialization of the individual.

The following NSF staff served as Designated Federal Official(s) during the meeting:

Dr. Tracy Kimbrel (CISE/CCF/TRIPODS)

Dr. Jack Snoeyink (CISE/CCF/AF

Dr. Rahul Shah (CISE/CCF/AF)

The meeting began with Dr. Kimbrel welcoming the panelists followed by a description of the CCF Computing and Communication Foundations (CCF): Core Programs, the review procedures, and conflict of interest (COI) rules. Panelists were cautioned about the confidentiality of the proposals under review and of the confidentiality of the identities of the panel members and the review discussions. All the panelists read and signed the NSF Conflict of Interests (COI) form.

Reviewers on the panel were identified as having conflict of interest with the following proposals:

Panelist Name Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| De, Anindya | 1703925, 1704188 |
| Mahoney, Michael | 1703689, 1703861 |
| Papadimitriou, Christos | 1703574, 1703925, 1703996, 1704188, 1704417 |
| Raykova, Mariana | 1703925, 1704188 |
| Steurer, David | 1703223, 1704299 |
| Vazirani, Vijay | 1702564, 1704046 |

Program directors or observers had no / also had conflicts that caused them to absent themselves from discussions of proposals.  (List PD: project lead ids, if any.)

Program directors obtained waivers for the following panelist conflicts:  *Note: list conflicts and reason for waiver, or Delete if not applicable*

The closed sessions dealt with the review and evaluation of proposals. The proposals contained information of a proprietary or confidential nature, financial data (such as salaries), and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters fall within exemptions 4 and 6 US Code 552b(c), Government in Sunshine Act. During the discussions, anyone with conflicts stepped out of the room and did not return until the discussion of the conflicted proposal had concluded.

Panelists had been supplied with the proposals they were to initially consider prior to the meeting. They had been asked to complete their initial reviews prior to the meeting, with the exception of material related to the discussion. This was added to the reviews at the meeting.

All obvious conflicts of interest were prevented by prior assignment of proposals to panelists. The program officer present handled any other potential conflicts of interest that arose. A federal officer was present at every session. Conflicts required the conflicted panelist to leave the room, or to log off of the virtual panel interface. Panelists, did not participate in discussions of any proposals with which they have a conflict of interest.

In cases where a project received no on-time review rating higher than Good (G) and where all reviewers agreed that that the reviews provided adequate assessment of the project's merit and adequate feedback to the PI, the panel could opt not to discuss the project, to reserve the time to discuss higher rated proposals in greater detail. These proposals were noted as “Not Discussed by Panel” (NDP). For each proposal discussed by the panel, a scribe captured the discussion in a panel summary and the panel gave a recommendation to NSF for further consideration of Highly Competitive (HC), Competitive (C), Low Competitive (LC), and Not Competitive (NC). Copies of the individual reviews and panel summary (if applicable) will be sent to the principal investigator.

The panel reviewed and evaluated proposals for suitability of funding. Prior to the panel meeting, all reviewers had been informed of the set of proposals they were to review electronically using FastLane. Panelists were requested to specifically address the intellectual merit and broader impact of each proposal. Each proposal had at least three members who had written individual reviews and assigned individual ratings of Excellent (E), Very Good (VG), Good (G), Fair (F) or Poor (P) to each proposal. The reviews were submitted via FastLane.

These minutes are an accurate summary of the matters discussed and conclusions reached at this meeting.

Certified by:

Dr. Tracy Kimbrel 10/25/2017

CISE/CCF

Panel Minutes must be completed and signed within 90 days of the panel.