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«Dir\_name» («Dir»)

«Div\_name» («org\_code»)

«pgm\_ele\_name» («pgm\_ele\_code»)

«pgm\_annc\_id» «solicitation»

Review Analysis Recommendation: **Decline**

Total request: «tot\_rqst»

«prop\_titl\_txt»

**L: «prop\_id0» «last0»**, «frst0» «inst0» «rqst0»

**N: «prop\_id1» «last1»**, «frst1» «inst1» «rqst1»

**N: «prop\_id2» «last2»**, «frst2» «inst2» «rqst2»

**N: «prop\_id3» «last3»**, «frst3» «inst3» «rqst3»

**N: «prop\_id4» «last4»**, «frst4» «inst4» «rqst4»

**N: «prop\_id5» «last5»**, «frst5» «inst5» «rqst5»

**«panl\_id0»** **«rec0»** «panl\_name0» («pnlst0» panelists; «confl0» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end0», recommended as «RCOM\_TXT0» («revs0»)

Std competition rank «rank0» of «panlString0»

**«panl\_id1»** **«rec1»** «panl\_name1» («pnlst1» panelists; «confl1» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end1», recommended as «RCOM\_TXT1» («revs1»)

Std competition rank «rank1» of «panlString1»

**«panl\_id2» «rec2»** «panl\_name2» («pnlst2» panelists; «confl2» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end2»,recommended as «RCOM\_TXT2» («revs2»)

Std competition rank «rank2» of «panlString2»

**Ad hoc** reviews («AhNrev»): «AhRevs», with last on «AhLast»

«RApre\_note»

**PROJECT OVERVIEW**[[Brief description of the project]]

**INTELLECTUAL MERIT**[[Brief description of the Intellectual Merit strengths and weaknesses in the words of the PDs]]

**BROADER IMPACTS**[[Brief description of the Broader Impacts strengths and weaknesses in the words of the PDs]]

**REVIEW SUMMARY**[[«allReviews» Brief description of the panel characteristics, tone, attitudes and/or issues -- anything not in the context statement. Include PDs opinion of the proposal, use and timing of Ad Hocs, explanation of wider range of reviews, and any extenuating circumstances or panel surprises. Keep in mind that this will be in the permanent record, and may be seen by a FOIA request.]]

**RECOMMENDATION**[[Requested action, rationale for action (program/cluster process, available funding, program priorities and balance, etc), funding decision-making process]]

As Program Director, I evaluated this proposal for funding in light of its intellectual merit and broader impacts relative to the goals of the program, taking into account the reviews and ratings, the panel discussions and panel summary. I also considered this proposal in relation to other proposals reviewed in this and other panels, the need to maintain appropriate balance among subfields, the total amount of funds available to the program for new proposals, and general Foundation policies. I concur with the panel's assessment and recommend that this project be declined.

«RAsigner»

«RAsigner2»
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«RAps\_note»