

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION SUBMISSION

Title of Collection: National Science Foundation Directorate for Technology, Innovation and Partnerships Reviewer Request Form

Type of Request: Renewal of an information collection (3145-0273)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Section A. Justification

This request seeks approval to renew the *U.S. National Science Foundation Directorate for Technology, Innovation and Partnerships (NSF TIP) Reviewer Request Form*. The form collects information from individuals who wish to express interest in being considered for future proposal review opportunities within NSF TIP.

NSF relies on external reviewers as a central part of its merit review process. Reviewers provide the scientific, technical, disciplinary, sectoral, and contextual expertise needed to evaluate proposals submitted to NSF funding opportunities. NSF maintains a general mechanism for individuals to indicate interest in serving as reviewers, NSF 428A. While that agency-wide mechanism remains important, it was designed for traditional NSF programs that are organized primarily by discipline. TIP needs a more tailored form to identify potential reviewers for programs that span use-inspired research, technology translation, innovation ecosystems, workforce development, and cross-sector partnerships.

The programs within TIP's portfolio include: [Accelerating Research Translation \(ART\)](#), [AI-ready America](#), [America's Seed Fund](#), [Finders Foundry](#), [Innovation Corps \(I-Corps\)](#), [National Network for Microelectronics Education](#), [INTERN](#), [Tech Accelerators](#), [Pathways to Enable Open-Source Ecosystems](#), [Proto-OKN](#), [Regional Innovation Engines](#), [Safe-OSE](#), [Programmable Cloud Laboratories \(PCL\) Test Bed](#), and [Transition to Practice](#). These programs reflect various phases of technology translation spectrum and workforce development. Together, they help move discoveries toward practice, strengthen innovation capacity, prepare the skilled technical workforce, and bring together partners from academia, industry, government, nonprofits, and communities of practice. Ultimately, they support TIP's missions to engage all Americans in accelerating critical and emerging technologies, expand the geography of American innovation, and build a competition-ready workforce.

Due to the specialized nature of these programs, it is necessary for TIP to refine its reviewer recruitment efforts to identify individuals with appropriate combinations of expertise and experience in areas such as technology translation, commercialization, startups and entrepreneurship, venture development, regional innovation, workforce pathways, industry partnerships, community engagement, and other cross-sector domains to serve as proposal reviewers for these programs. Given this scope, NSF TIP requests the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to renew this directorate-wide Reviewer Request Form to collect information that is germane to TIP's reviewer needs and responsive to needs of individual programs within the Directorate.

The *TIP Reviewer Request Form* is organized into eight sections:

1. Contact Information
2. Professional Background
3. Educational Background
4. Areas of Expertise and Review Interest
5. Previous Reviewer Experience
6. NSF Award or Proposal Experience
7. Demographic Information
8. Statement of Interest

This renewal includes several revisions intended to improve the clarity of the form and enhance TIP's ability to identify potential reviewer matches. Revisions include adding a follow-up item on the potential reviewer's U.S. state or territory residence (#5); revising employment-related items to ask for "current title or role" and "current organization or affiliation", rather than "employment / job title" and "employing institution or organization" to better reflect respondents who may be retired, self-employed, consultants, or affiliated with multiple professional settings (#6, 7); expanding response options for organization or affiliation type (#9); and separating educational background (#11, 12) into its own section. The revised form also adds an item on professional or functional area(s) of expertise (#13), an item asking whether respondents have particular TIP programs, program areas, or proposal topics they would be interested in reviewing (#15), and a follow-up item asking which NSF program an individual previously served as a reviewer (#19). Finally, the renewal adds a new section on NSF award or proposal experience to capture whether potential reviewers have previously been involved with NSF as applicants or awardees (#20 - 23).

A.1 Circumstances Requiring the Collection of Data

The primary reason for this data collection is to enable TIP program directors to better assess whether interested individuals have the appropriate combination of experience, expertise, and skills to help evaluate proposals through NSF's merit review process, consistent with the merit review criteria established by NSF and the National Science Board. As such, the data collected will be used strictly for reviewer recruiting and reviewer matching purposes.

A.2 Purposes and Use of the Data

The *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* is designed primarily to identify individuals who may be suitable reviewers for the range of programs within the NSF TIP Directorate.

The data collected will be used for the following purposes:

- **Recruitment.** Identifying individuals with relevant education, professional experience, sector knowledge, technical expertise, and other backgrounds that may make them suitable candidates to serve as proposal reviewers.
- **Communication and Outreach.** Communicating with individuals who have expressed interest in serving as potential reviewers about upcoming funding opportunities and webinars. These communications may help potential reviewers better understand TIP's missions, programs, and review needs, and may support TIP's efforts to broaden its pool of qualified reviewers.

A.3 Use of Information Technology to Reduce Burden

All components in the collection will utilize electronic forms and electronic submissions to minimize data entry errors and respondent burden. In some cases, Program Directors, NSF staff, and/or NSF authorized contractors may contact the respondents for follow-up questions to clarify information provided and to assess potential conflicts of interest if an individual were to be considered for service as an NSF reviewer for the TIP Directorate.

A.4 Efforts to Identify Duplication

While the *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* and *NSF agency-wide Reviewer Request Form (NSF 428A)* share similar data fields, the *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* is designed to collect more targeted information relevant to TIP's programs and reviewer needs. These additional fields include more detailed information on functional expertise, technical domains, commercialization experience, and/or community involvement. Notwithstanding these similarities, the *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* does not duplicate other efforts undertaken by NSF, other federal agencies, or other data collection agents.

A.5 Small Business

N/A

A.6 Consequences of Not Collecting the Information

If the information were not collected, the TIP Directorate would be less able to identify and recruit individuals whose experience and expertise align with reviewer needs of TIP programs.

Programs within NSF rely on the expertise and judgement of reviewers in evaluating proposals submitted to competitive funding opportunities. Because TIP programs often differ from traditional academically oriented programs in other NSF Directorates, identifying reviewers with relevant cross-sector, translational, technical, and professional experience is important to directorate's ability to conduct well-informed merit review. Without this collection, TIP program directors would have fewer tools to identify potential reviewers with the appropriate combination of experience, expertise, and perspective needed to support informed, effective, and unbiased proposal review. Importantly, a key part of Congress' change to TIP upon its establishment – and a key goal of the current Administration – is to welcome new entrants into the research and funding ecosystem; this reviewer collection form allows NSF TIP to do so, not only in the solicitation of new proposals, but also in the review of those proposals, to ensure true peer review.

A.7 Special Circumstances Justifying Inconsistencies with Guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6

Data collected for the *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* will comply with 5 CFR 1320.6. First, a valid OMB control number will be displayed at the beginning of the electronic form. Second, as such reporting is voluntary, respondents can choose to answer some or all fields on the Form.

A.8 Federal Register Notice and Consultation Outside the Agency

The agency's notice, as required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), was published in the *Federal Register Bulletin* on 22 May 2026, at 91 FR 30330. No comments from the public were received.

A.9. Payments or Gifts to Respondents

Not applicable

A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality

Respondents will be informed that any information on specific individuals will be maintained in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974. Each data collection instrument will display both OMB control number and Privacy Act notices.

Respondents will also be informed that data collected are available to NSF staff, as well as authorized contractors who manage the data and data collection software. Data will be processed in accordance with applicable federal and state privacy statutes. The data collection system will limit access to personally identifiable information to authorized users.

A.11 Questions of a Sensitive Nature

The *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form* requests personal information, including name, contact information, professional affiliation, education level, areas of expertise, and demographic information. All of these, including the demographic questions, are optional. Respondents have the option to decline to answer any question included the form.

A.12 Estimates of Response Burden

A.12.1. Number of Respondents, Frequency of Response, and Annual Hour Burden

Respondents: Individuals who express interest in being considered as a NSF/TIP reviewer

Estimated Number of Annual Respondents: 3,000

Frequency: Once

Average Time: 0.25 hours

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 750 hours per year

A.12.2. Estimates of Annualized Cost to Respondents for the Hour Burdens

The overall annualized cost to the respondents is estimated to be \$45,000.

The respondents of the *NSF TIP Reviewer Request Form*, albeit with varying education level and professional experience, are generally doctorate degree holders. According to a study conducted by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in 2025, the median income for doctorate degree holders was around \$122,876 ("Education pays, 2024," Career Outlook, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2025). Using that as the basis for the calculation—divide that median income by the number of standard annual work hours (2,080), which calculates to approximately \$60 per hour, the annualized estimate of cost to the respondents is around \$45,000 per year.

Table 1. Annuitized Cost to Respondents

Respondent Type	No. of annual Respondents	Burden Hours Per Respondent	Average Hourly Rate	Estimated Annual Cost
Individuals interested in serving as NSF/TIP reviewers	3000	0.25	\$60	\$45,000
Total				\$45,000

A.13 Estimate of Total Capital and Startup Costs/Operation and Maintenance Costs to Respondents or Record Keepers

Not applicable.

A.14 Estimates of Costs to the Federal Government

The team of contractors would be assigned to design the web form, collect and clean the data. In addition, there may be costs associated with maintenance of a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) or survey collection platform. The budget for such effort would be about \$100,000 over the course of three years.

A.15. Changes in Burden

The burden has decreased due to refining the number of potential reviewers. The burden time has not changed, however.

A.16. Plans for Publication, Analysis, and Schedule

Not applicable.

A.17. Approval to Not Display Expiration Date

Not applicable.

A.18 Exceptions to Item 19 of OMB Form 83-I

No exceptions apply.