NSF reserves the right to potentially continue this iterative process until 16-months post award start date, at which point the last submitted component plan will be deemed as the final version of the document that NSF shall consider for approval in line with the program goals. A more detailed set of expectations for each deliverable will be provided by the Program Officer post award

- i. Engine Vision and Mission Statements (month 4)
- ii. Governance and Management
 - Governance and Management Plan (month 4)
 - O Partnership Agreement (month 4)
 - Workforce Development Agreement (month 16)
 - IP Management Plan (month 4)
 - Financial and Resource Sustainability Plan (month 16)
- iii. Strengths, Weaknesses,
 Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT)
 Analyses for R&D and Translation,
 Workforce Development, and
 Inclusive Engagement (month 4)
- iv. Strategic Plans
 - For R&D and Translation (month 9)
 - For Workforce Development (month 16)
 - For Inclusive Engagement (month 12)

- v. Implementation Plans
 - For R&D and Translation (month 12)
 - For Workforce Development (month 16)
 - For Inclusive Engagement (month 12)
- vi. Evaluation Plan (month 9)
- vii. IP Agreements (month 10)
- viii. Benchmarks; Baselines; Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely (SMART) Objectives and Targets
 - For R&D and Translation (month 12)
 - For Workforce Development (month 16)
 - For Inclusive Engagement (month 16)

Engines awardees will publicly disseminate the following within 1 month of approval by NSF: a public version of their SWOT analyses; strategic plans; and implementation plans.

The first annual evaluation report is expected at month 18 from the award start date, and then annually thereafter for the life of the award. The report is prepared and submitted to NSF by an external evaluation team required of each Engine award. The report discusses

progress relative to the milestones, baselines, benchmarks, objectives, and targets as listed in the corresponding 5-year strategic and implementation plan. The evaluation reports provide an objective and independent assessment of how each Engine is performing relative to their goals and milestones, and are not subject to approval by Engine awardees.

Information gathered will be used for the dual and interrelated purposes of disseminating information about the NSF Engines program and using this information to make programmatic improvements, efficiencies, and enhanced program monitoring for NSF Engines. Feedback collected under this clearance provides useful information for the continued evolution of the NSF Engines program. The collective reporting requirements will help TIP monitor the progress of individual Engines, identify trends over time, assess overall program performance.

Burden on the Public

For each Engine award, we anticipate the following number of responses and response burden by reporting requirement:

Reporting requirements	Number of responses per year	Minimum burden per response (hours)	Maximum burden per response (hours)	Annual burden (hours) per engine
Quarterly ReportsA Five (5)-year Strategic and Implementation Plan	4	Year 1: 200 Year 1: 400	20 Year 2: 80 Year 2: 160 80–160	Year 3: 80.
Total	5			120–480.

We estimated that, on average, each of the twenty components of the Five-year Strategic and Implementation Plan could take up to 520 hours to complete, hence the upper bound estimate of 10,400 hours per Engine. We also anticipate that each component of the Plan will be developed and completed by multiple and various team members within an Engine.

In addition, the upper bound estimate for the annual evaluation report reflects not only the effort for writing the report but also account for data cleaning, data analysis, and data visualization. We anticipate that the burden for subsequent years to be lower as workflow and cadence will be established after the first year.

A total of 10 Engine teams were awarded. For the first year, the total amount of burden estimated is between 1,280 and 11,520 hours per Engine. For subsequent years, 320 and 1,280 hours.

Dated: October 24, 2024.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2024–25125 Filed 10–29–24; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 7555–01–P**

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Request for Public Comment: Request for Information on the CHIPS and Science Act, Section 10343

AGENCY: National Science Foundation. **ACTION:** Request for public comment; Extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On August 27, 2024, the National Science Foundation (NSF) published in the **Federal Register** a document entitled "Request for

Information on the CHIPS and Science Act, Section 10343." In response to requests by prospective commenters that they would benefit from additional time to adequately consider and respond to the RFI, NSF has determined that an extension of the comment period until Friday, December 13, 2024, at 11:59 p.m. (eastern), is appropriate.

DATES: The end of the comment period for the document entitled "Request for Information" published on August 27, 2024 (89 FR 68657), is extended from November 15, 2024, until December 13, 2024.

ADDRESSES: To respond to this Request for Information, please use the official submission form available at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ResearchEthicsRFI.

Respondents only need to provide feedback on one or more questions of interest or relevance to them. Each question is voluntary and optional. The response to each question has a 4,000character limit including spaces.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information, please direct questions to Jason Borenstein through email: *CHIPSethicsRFI@nsf.gov*, phone: 703–292–4207, or mail: 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314, USA.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 10343 ("Research Ethics") of the CHIPS and Science Act of 2022 (Pub. L. 117-167) directs NSF to incorporate ethical, social, safety, and security considerations into the merit review process that is used to evaluate research projects or other activities for funding. Section 10343 notes that "a number of emerging areas of research have potential ethical, social, safety, and security implications that might be apparent as early as the basic research stage." In addition, Section 10343 states that "the incorporation of ethical, social, safety, and security considerations into the research design and review process for Federal awards may help mitigate potential harms before they happen.' Moreover, Section 10343 states that "The Foundation should continue to work with stakeholders to promote best practices for governance of research in emerging technologies at every stage of research.

Through this Request for Information, NSF seeks input on ways to incorporate ethical, social, safety, and security considerations into the agency's merit review process and to develop strategies for mitigating the potential harms of scientific research and amplifying societal benefits from such research. Responses to one or more of the questions listed below can be sent to NSF by using the official submission form.

Ethical, Social, Safety, and Security Considerations

Question 1: Describe ethical, social, safety, and/or security risks from current or emerging research activities that you believe might be of concern to the community, profession, or organization with which you are connected.

Question 2: Which products, technologies, and/or other outcomes from research do you think could cause significant harm to the public in the foreseeable future?

Question 3: Describe one or more approaches for identifying ethical, social, safety, and/or security risks from research activities and balancing such risks against potential benefits.

Question 4: Describe one or more strategies for encouraging research

teams to incorporate ethical, social, safety, and/or security considerations into the design of their research approach. Also, how might the strategy vary depending on research type (for example, basic vs. applied) or setting (for example, academia or industry)?

NSF's Approach to Ethical, Social, Safety, and Security Considerations

Question 5: How might NSF work with stakeholders to promote best practices for governance of research in emerging technologies at every stage of research?

Question 6: How could ethical, social, safety, and/or security considerations be incorporated into the instructions for proposers or into NSF's merit review process? Also, what challenges could arise if the merit review process is modified to include such considerations?

Question 7: What other measures could NSF consider as it seeks to identify and mitigate ethical, social, safety, and/or security risks from research projects or other activities that the agency supports?

NSF, at its discretion, will use the information submitted in response to this RFI to help inform future program directions, new initiatives, and potential funding opportunities. The information provided will be analyzed, may appear in reports, and may be shared publicly on agency websites. Respondents are advised that the government is under no obligation to acknowledge receipt of the information or provide feedback to respondents with respect to any information submitted. No proprietary, classified, confidential, or sensitive information should be included in your response submission. The government reserves the right to use any nonproprietary technical information in any resultant solicitations, policies, or procedures.

Authority: Public Law 117–167.

Dated: October 25, 2024.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2024–25183 Filed 10–29–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-P

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 9:30 a.m. EDT, November 19, 2024.

PLACE: NTSB Conference Center, 429 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Washington, DC 20594.

STATUS: The one item is open to the public.

MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED:

72737 Highway Investigation Report— Box Truck Centerline Crossover Collision With Bus, Louisville, NY, January 28, 2023

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Candi Bing at (202) 590–8384 or by email at *bingc@ntsb.gov*.

Media Information Contact: Sarah Sulick by email at sarah.sulick@ntsb.gov or at (202) 314–6100.

The public may view it through a live or archived webcast by accessing a link under "Upcoming Events" on the NTSB home page at www.ntsb.gov.

Schedule updates, including weatherrelated cancellations, are also available at www.ntsb.gov.

The National Transportation Safety Board is holding this meeting under the Government in the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. 552(b).

Dated: October 28, 2024.

LaSean R. McCray,

Assistant Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 2024–25376 Filed 10–28–24; 4:15 pm] BILLING CODE 7533–01–P

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. RM2024–9 and N2024–1; Order Nos. 7793 and 7794]

RIN 3211-AA39

Service Performance Measurement Systems for Market Dominant Products

AGENCY: Postal Regulatory Commission. **ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission is acknowledging that the Postal Service's proposed revisions to its Service Performance Measurement (SPM) Plan for Market Dominant products from Docket No. N2024–1 will be considered as part of Docket No. RM2024–9. This document invites public comments and takes other administrative steps.

DATES: Comments are due: November 20, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at https://www.prc.gov. Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David A. Trissell, General Counsel, at 202–789–6820.