

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration



Criteria and Requirements for the Phase A Concept Study Report

Solar Terrestrial Probes Program

**Dynamical Neutral Atmosphere-
Ionosphere Coupling**

(DYNAMIC)

October 7, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I – EVALUATION CRITERIA	4
A. Scientific Merit of the Proposed Investigation	4
B. Scientific Implementation Merit and Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation	5
C. TMC Feasibility of the Proposed Mission Implementation	7
D. Programmatic Value of the Proposed Investigation	10
E. Merit of the Student Collaboration and Small Business Subcontracting Plans	10
Weighting of Criteria	11
Additional Selection Factors	11
PART II – CONCEPT STUDY REPORT OUTLINE AND REQUIREMENTS	12
A. Cover Page and Investigation Summary	16
B. Fact Sheet and Executive Summary	18
C. CSR Table of Contents	18
D. Science Investigation	18
E. Science Implementation	19
E.1. Level 1 and Level 2 Requirements	19
E.2. Science Mission Profile	20
E.3. Instrumentation	21
E.4. Data Sufficiency	22
E.5. Data Plan	22
E.6. Science Team	23
E.7. Plan for SEO	23
F. Mission Implementation	23
F.1. General Requirements and Mission Traceability	23
F.2. Mission Concept Descriptions	24
F.3. Development Approach	30
F.4. New Technologies/Advanced Engineering Developments	31
F.5. Assembly, Integration, Test, and Verification	32
F.6. Schedule	32
G. Management	34
H. Preliminary Design and Technology Completion (Phase B) Plan	38
I. Cost and Cost Estimating Methodology	39
J. Justification and Cost Proposal for Any Science Enhancement Option(s)	47
K. Optional Student Collaboration	48

L.	CSR Appendices	48
L.1.	Letters of Commitment and Letters of Support	48
L.2.	Relevant Experience and Past Performance.....	49
L.3.	Resumes	50
L.4.	Inclusion Plan.....	51
L.5.	Phase B Contract Implementation Data	52
L.6.	Data Management Plan and Software Management Plan	52
L.7.	Citizen Science Plan.....	53
L.8.	Incentive Plan(s).....	55
L.9.	Technical Content of any International Agreement(s).....	55
L.10.	International Participation Plans (Update from Proposal)	55
L.11.	Requirements Related to Orbital Debris, Collision Avoidance and End-of-Mission	56
L.12.	Compliance with Procurement Regulations by NASA PI Proposals.....	57
L.13.	Master Equipment List.....	57
L.14.	Heritage	58
L.15.	Classified Materials.....	59
L.16.	Small Business Subcontracting Plan.....	59
L.17.	Additional Cost Data to Assist Validation (Optional)	59
L.18.	Science Change Matrix	59
L.19.	Impact to the Investigation if GDC Data are not Available.....	60
L.20.	Communications Design Data.....	60
L.21.	Project Protection Plan	61
L.22.	Cybersecurity	61
L.23.	Draft Mission Definition Requirements Agreement	62
L.24.	Draft MAIP and MAR Compliance Matrix	62
L.25.	Rideshare Accommodation Worksheet.....	62
L.26.	Storage Plan	63
L.27.	Flexibility to Launch Configuration.....	63
L.28.	Justification for the use of non-AMMOS MOS/GDS Tools.....	63
L.29.	Impact of SIS Update (Optional)	64
L.30.	Acronyms and Abbreviations List	64
L.31.	References and Management Standards List	64
PART III – OTHER FACTORS REQUIRED AFTER DOWN-SELECTION.....		65
PART IV – ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....		66

**DYNAMIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF OPPORTUNITY (NNH23ZDA0190)
CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
PHASE A CONCEPT STUDY**

INTRODUCTION

As the outcome of the DYNAMIC Announcement of Opportunity (NNH23ZDA0190, hereafter, the “AO”) Step-1 competition, NASA selected three investigations that the Agency will fund to perform concept studies. The concept study for each selected investigation will constitute the investigation’s Concept and Technology Development Phase (Phase A) of the Formulation process as outlined in NPR 7120.5, *NASA Space Flight Program and Project Requirements*.

Documents available through the DYNAMIC Program Library at <https://soma.larc.nasa.gov/STP/DYNAMIC/programlibrary.html> are intended to provide guidance for selected investigations. This website is hereafter referred to as the Program Library. New documents have been added to the Program Library for this Step-2 competition, and some documents have been updated. Concept Study Teams are responsible for reviewing these documents to ensure they address all applicable requirements for the versions noted.

Concept studies are intended to provide NASA with more definitive information regarding the cost, risk, and feasibility of the investigations, as well as small business subcontracting plans, optional Student Collaborations (SCs) and Science Enhancement Options (SEOs) if proposed, before final selection for implementation.

The product of a concept study is a Concept Study Report (CSR), to be delivered to NASA approximately nine months after the Concept Study Kick-Off Meeting (see below). This document provides criteria and requirements for preparing a CSR. All program constraints, guidelines, definitions, and requirements specified in the AO are applicable to the CSR, except as noted herein.

The table below lists several items that were deferred from Step 1 and that must be provided in the CSR.

Table 1. Items Deferred from Step 1

Topic	AO Reference	C&R Reference
Independent Verification and Validation of Software	AO Section 4.6.1	Error! Reference source not found.
Details of coordination with Conjunction Analysis Risk Analysis	AO Section 4.6.4	Requirement CS-126 and Appendix L.11
Science Enhancement Option or its cost, if proposed	AO Section 5.1.5	Section J
Discussion of maximum channel bandwidth compliance	AO Section 5.2.6.2	Requirement CS-42 and Appendix L.19
Discussion of critical event coverage capabilities	AO Section 5.2.7	Requirement CS-36 and Requirement CS-42
Orbital debris and end of mission disposal plan	AO Sections 5.2.8 and J.8	Appendix L.11
Non-AMMOS system use description	AO Section 5.2.9	Appendix L.28
Description of the Space Systems Protection implementation	AO Section 5.2.10	Appendix L.21
Ground system data flow diagram	AO Section 5.2.11	Appendix L.22
Naming of Project Manager (PM) and Project Systems Engineer (PSE)	AO Sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3	Requirement CS-57
Student Collaborations, if proposed	AO Section 5.5.2	Section K
Discussion of cost estimate error and uncertainty	AO Section 5.6.3	Requirement CS-82
Schedule-based end-to-end component of the Data Management Plan	AO Appendix B, Section E.4	Appendix L.6
Requirements for real year dollar costs	AO Section 5.6.2	Section H

CSRs and all required and optional files are due by 4 p.m. U.S. Eastern time on the following dates by the method specified in Requirement CS-11:

Deadline for CSR with all AppendicesMay 12, 2025

Deadline for Augmented SubmissionMay 19, 2025

Deadline for provision of draft SOWsSite Visit date

PART I of this document describes the evaluation criteria for CSRs. PART II provides guidelines for preparing CSRs; every requirement in these guidelines must be addressed in the section in which the requirement appears. An explanation and justification must be provided for any requirement that is not fully addressed in the CSR. PART III describes other factors that are not required and will not be evaluated, but will need to be provided by the project shortly after a continuation decision (*i.e.*, “down-selection”).

For each investigation selected in Step 1, the Solar Terrestrial Probe (STP) Program Office at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) will negotiate a Phase A contract, without a priced option for a Phase B Bridge Phase.

Since evaluation of CSRs is a major part of Step 2 in the acquisition process, NASA will assemble an evaluation team of scientific and technical peers to carefully consider each CSR. Because members of this evaluation team may not have reviewed, nor will be provided access to, Step-1 proposals, each CSR package (the CSR together with all required and optional files) must be a self-contained submission.

The CSR evaluation process will include visits (either in person, virtual, or hybrid) by the evaluation team to each investigation team's chosen site, to hear oral briefings and, if needed, to receive updates and clarification of material in the CSRs. These briefings will be conducted approximately three months following submission of the CSRs; scheduling and expectations for the Site Visits will be addressed at the Concept Study Kick-Off Meeting. NASA may identify significant weaknesses, questions, and requests for information, and ask that the investigation team respond to these either prior to, during, or after the Site Visit. Any additional information provided to NASA by the investigation team will be considered during the evaluation and treated as updates and clarifications to the CSR.

Investigation teams are responsible for the content and quality of their CSRs, Site Visit presentations, and responses to weaknesses and questions, including parts that may be prepared by partner organizations or by any other individual. All assumptions and calculations should be carefully documented in the CSR and agreed to by the Principal Investigator (PI) and their team, to ensure that they are accurate and that they will satisfy NASA requirements. Investigation teams are also responsible for ensuring that all requirements specified in Part II of this document are addressed.

As the outcome of Step 2, it is anticipated that the Selection Official, the Associate Administrator of the Science Mission Directorate (SMD) at NASA Headquarters or their designee, plans to continue one investigation into the subsequent phases of mission development for flight and operation. The target date for this down-selection is approximately five months after the CSRs are due to NASA.

Upon the down-selection decision, NASA will negotiate a Phase B contract with the down-selected investigation team.

For those investigations that are not continued, the Phase A contracts will be allowed to terminate without further expense to NASA. Every investigation team will be offered a debriefing of the evaluation of its CSR.

PART I – EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation of CSRs is very similar to the evaluation of Step-1 proposals, as described in Section 7.1 of the AO. The evaluation criteria and their factors, specified in Section 7.2 of the AO, apply fully to CSRs. However, all factors related to the probability of mission success and to the realism of the proposed costs to NASA will be considered in greater depth of detail. Additional factors, such as implementation plans for Student Collaborations and small business subcontracting, will also be evaluated. In case of conflict between the AO and the *Criteria and Requirements for the Phase A Concept Study Report (C&R)*, the C&R document takes precedence.

All information relevant to the evaluation will be considered during the evaluation of Step 2 concept studies, including information contained in the CSR, information presented during the Site Visit, and information provided in response to potential weaknesses and clarifying questions.

Each CSR must be a self-contained submission and must not refer to information contained in the Step-1 proposal and associated clarification documents. Except for compliance checking by NASA (*e.g.*, that the PIMMC has not grown by more than 20%) and for determining if re-evaluation of the *Scientific Merit of the Proposed Investigation* and/or the *Programmatic Value of the Proposed Investigation* is required (as described below), the Step-1 proposals will not be used in the Step-2 evaluation.

The evaluation criteria for the Step-2 evaluation are:

- A. Scientific Merit of the Proposed Investigation (Form A);
- B. Scientific Implementation Merit and Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation (Form B);
- C. Technical, Management and Cost (TMC) Feasibility of the Proposed Mission Implementation (Form C);
- D. Programmatic Value of the Proposed Investigation (Form D);
- E. Merit of the Student Collaboration Plan (Form E); and
- F. Merit of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Form F).

A. SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF THE PROPOSED INVESTIGATION

The DYNAMIC Program Scientist will determine whether any issues that may have emerged in the course of the concept study have resulted in significant changes to the science objectives or other aspects of the proposed Baseline and Threshold Science Investigations (see Requirement CS-20 in PART II of this document) in such a manner as to have impacted the basis for the evaluation of the scientific merit of the investigation as determined by the peer review panel for the Step-1 proposal. If there are no significant changes to the proposed investigation that undermine the basis of this rating, the peer review panel rating for scientific merit of the Step-1 proposal will be the rating for scientific merit of the CSR. If there are significant changes, the Program Scientist will convene a peer review panel to re-evaluate the *Scientific Merit of the Proposed Investigation* in light of these changes. The factors for re-evaluating this criterion will be the same as those used for the Step-1 proposal review (Section 7.2.2 of the AO).

B. SCIENTIFIC IMPLEMENTATION MERIT AND FEASIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED INVESTIGATION

All of the factors defined in Section 7.2.3 of the AO also apply to the evaluation of the CSR. *New factors and details added to Step-1 AO factor definitions for the evaluation of the CSR are highlighted using blue italicized text.*

Factor B-1. Merit of the proposed mission design and measurement techniques for providing the anticipated data sets. This factor includes the ability for the anticipated measurements to lead to the anticipated data sets, *including details on data collection strategy and plans*; the ability for the proposed mission architecture and mission design to support the acquisition of the anticipated measurements; and the degree to which the measurement techniques can use the anticipated instrument observations to provide the anticipated scientific measurements. The mission architecture and mission design include the number and arrangement of spacecraft, the spacecraft trajectories and orbits during science operations, and observation targets.

Factor B-2. Merit of the proposed instruments for providing the anticipated observations. This factor includes the demonstration of the proposed instruments' ability, or clear path to demonstrate the necessary ability, to provide the anticipated observations; the adequacy of the plan to calibrate, cross-calibrate, and inter-calibrate the instruments to provide the anticipated measurements; the likelihood of success for the selected instruments to provide the anticipated observations within the mission design and operating environment; and the ability of the development and operation team(s)—both institutions and individuals—to successfully implement the calibration and observation plans. The instruments' operation within the mission design includes accommodation on the spacecraft and orientation during planned observations.

Factor B-3. Merit of the data analysis, data publication, and data and software management plans. This factor includes the merit of plans for data analysis of the anticipated measurements to produce the anticipated data sets; to publish investigation scientific results in the professional literature; and to publicly archive and preserve data and analysis of value to the science community. Considerations in this factor include assessment of planning and budget adequacy and evidence of plans for well-documented, high-level data products and software usable to the entire science community; the adherence of data and software plans to follow open science principles and requirements; assessment of adequate resources for physical interpretation of data; reporting scientific results in the professional literature (*e.g.*, refereed journals); and assessment of the proposed plan for the timely release of the data to the public domain for enlarging its science impact.

Factor B-4. Merit of the investigation design for science resiliency. This factor includes both developmental and operational resiliency for providing the anticipated data sets. Developmental resiliency includes the preservation of the investigation's ability to complete some or all of the science objectives with descopes in the mission implementation. Operational resiliency includes the investigation's inclusion of multiple observation-target options that would enable completion of the science objectives and/or multiple opportunities to acquire measurements of a given observation target; and ability to acquire and calibrate the anticipated measurements in light of

adverse circumstances, during mission degradation, and while recovering from anomalies in flight.

Factor B-5. Merit of science team management and structure. This factor will be evaluated by assessing the experience, expertise, and organizational structure of the science team in context of the mission design, instruments, and planned investigation. The scientific expertise, project management ability, and demonstrated team leadership ability of the PI and science team leadership will be evaluated in terms of their assigned responsibilities. The organizational structure will be evaluated both in terms of management of the investigation science team and execution of the science investigation. The role of each Co-Investigator will be evaluated for necessary contributions to the proposed investigation; the inclusion of Co-Is who do not have a well-defined and appropriate role may be cause for downgrading during evaluation.

Comments about the managerial experience of the PI, and whether appropriate mentoring and support tools are in place, will be made to the Selecting Official but these comments shall not impact the investigation's Scientific Implementation Merit rating.

~~Factor B-6. Merit of the Diversity and Inclusion Plan. This factor includes the alignment of the proposal with NASA's core value of inclusion, the effectiveness of the plan in achieving its objectives in the context of mission success, the inclusion of mentoring and career development opportunities to train the next generation of science leaders, and transparency of annual reporting to NASA.~~ *This factor includes the extent to which the Inclusion Plan provided appropriate processes and goals for both creating and sustaining a positive and inclusive working environment for the investigation team; the extent to which the Inclusion Plan demonstrates awareness of systemic barriers to creating inclusive working environments that are or may be specific to the proposal team; whether the Inclusion Plan contains appropriate activities for equipping team members to build and maintain inclusive working environments; whether roles and responsibilities for those participating in the proposed activities are well described and justified; whether the proposed timeline is reasonable for the proposed Inclusion Plan activities; whether the Inclusion Plan provides reasonable and appropriate assessment mechanisms for measuring progress in and success of the proposed activities; and whether reasonable resources are requested to carry out the proposed activities and if funds are requested, with appropriate justification.*

Factor B-7. Maturity of proposed Level 1 and Level 2 requirements. *This factor includes assessment of whether the Level 1 requirements are sufficient and mature enough to guide the achievement of the objectives of the Baseline Science Investigation and the Threshold Science Investigation, and whether the Level 2 requirements are a sufficient decomposition of the Level 1 requirements. The Levels 1 and 2 requirements will be evaluated for whether they are stated in unambiguous, objective, quantifiable, and verifiable terms that do not conflict. Level 1 requirements will be evaluated on whether they are scientific determinations/results traceable to the science objectives and are sufficient to represent completion of the science objectives. Level 2 requirements will be evaluated for the adequacy, sufficiency, and completeness, including their utility for evaluating the capability of the mission profile, instruments, other mission systems, and other project-developed and non-project supporting capabilities to enable completion of the Level 1 requirements. The stability of the Level 1 and Level 2 requirements will be assessed*

including whether the requirements are ready, upon initiation of Phase B, to be placed under configuration control with little or no expected modifications for the lifecycle of the mission.

Factor B-8. Scientific Implementation Merit and Feasibility of any Science Enhancement Options (SEOs), if proposed. This factor includes assessing the potential and appropriateness of the selected activities to enlarge the science impact of the mission and the costing of the selected activities. Although evaluated by the same panel as the balance of Scientific Implementation Merit and Feasibility factors, this factor will not be considered in the overall criterion rating. The panel will provide comments to NASA on their findings for this factor.

The AO in Section 5.1.6 describes how Citizen Science (CS) can be included as part of the baseline science investigation, as part of a Student Collaboration (SC), and/or as part of an SEO.

- For CS proposed as part of the Baseline Science Investigation, the same standards apply as for the Baseline Science Investigation; evaluation of the CS is part of evaluation of Factors A and Factors B-1 through B-8.
- For CS proposed as part of a SEO, the same standards apply as for SEOs and evaluation of the CS is part Factor B-9.
- For CS proposed as part of a SC, the same standards apply as for SCs. Evaluation of the CS is part of Factor E in that case.
- A Citizen Science activity aimed solely at public communications and outreach does not need to be described in the CSR; communications and outreach will be developed in Phase B as part of the Communications Plan (see AO Section 4.1.3).

The review of the merit of the Citizen Science Plan will be led by individuals with practical and/or research experience in CS topics and the application of CS principles to teams.

C. TMC FEASIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED MISSION IMPLEMENTATION

All of the factors defined in Section 7.2.4 of the AO apply to the evaluation of the CSR. All of these factors are interpreted as including an assessment as to whether technical, management, and cost feasibility are at least at a Phase A level of maturity. *New factors and details added to Step-1 AO factor definitions are highlighted using blue italicized text.*

The risk management aspects of the Step-1 AO Factor C-4, Adequacy and robustness of the management approach and schedule, including the capability of the management team, have been removed from Factor C-4 and included in a new evaluation Factor C-6, Adequacy of the risk management plan.

Factor C-1. Adequacy and robustness of the instrument implementation plan. The maturity and technical readiness of the instrument complement will be assessed, as will the ability of the instruments to meet investigation requirements. This factor includes an assessment of the instrument design, accommodation, interface, heritage, and technology readiness. This factor includes an assessment of the instrument hardware and software designs, heritage, and margins. This factor includes an assessment of the processes, products, and activities required to accomplish development and integration of the instrument complement, including where

applicable the approach to multiple builds. This factor also includes adequacy of the plans for instrument systems engineering and for dealing with environmental concerns. This factor includes an assessment of plans for the development and use of new instrument technology, plans for advanced engineering developments, *and the adequacy of backup plans* to mature systems within the proposed cost and schedule when systems having a TRL less than 6 are proposed, *as applicable*.

Factor C-2. Adequacy and robustness of the mission design and plan for mission operations. This factor includes an assessment of the overall mission design and mission architecture, the spacecraft design and design margins (including margins for launch mass, delta-v, and propellant), the concept for mission operations (including communication, *ground systems, operational scenarios and timelines for each mission phase, operations team roles and responsibilities, navigation/tracking analysis* and, if applicable, constellation management), and the plans for launch services. This factor includes mission resiliency — the flexibility to recover from problems during both development and operations — including the technical resource reserves and margins, system and subsystem redundancy, and reductions and other changes that can be implemented without impact to the Baseline Science Investigation.

Factor C-3. Adequacy and robustness of the flight systems. This factor includes an assessment of the flight hardware and software designs, heritage, and margins. This factor includes an assessment of the plans, *processes*, products, and activities required to accomplish maturation, development, integration, and verification of all elements of the flight system, including the approach to multiple builds if applicable. This factor includes an assessment of the adequacy of all elements of flight system resiliency, including flight software/hardware fault management, system and subsystem redundancy, and hardware reliability. *This factor includes an assessment of the adequacy of the plans for spacecraft systems engineering, qualification, verification, mission assurance, and launch operations.* This factor includes the plans for the development and use of new technology, plans for advanced engineering developments, and the adequacy *of backup plans*, to ensure success of the investigation when systems having a TRL less than 6 are proposed. The maturity and technical readiness of the spacecraft, subsystems, *and operations systems* will be assessed. *The adequacy of the plan to mature systems within the proposed cost and schedule, the robustness of those plans, including recognition of risks and mitigation plans for retiring those risks, and the likelihood of success in developing any new technologies will be assessed.*

Factor C-4. Adequacy and robustness of the management approach and schedule, including the capability of the management team. This factor includes: the adequacy of the proposed organizational structure *and WBS; project-level systems engineering; the management approach including the roles of the named Key Management Team (KMT) members (PI, PM, PSE, and other identified individuals), the implementing organization, and known partners; the commitment, qualifications, and appropriate general management experience of the PI, PM, PSE, and other named KMT members; the specific spaceflight experience of the PM, PSE, and the other named KMT that report to them; the commitment, experience and relevant performance of the implementing organization and known partners against the needs of the investigation; the prior working relationships of the implementing organization and known partners; the commitments of partners and contributors; and the scope of work covering all elements of the mission, including contributions.* *Also evaluated under this factor is the approach to managing*

any commercial suppliers that will use their own safety and mission assurance (S&MA) practices. If multiple builds are proposed, this factor includes the ability to build, test, and integrate the required number of flight units with repeatable quality and performance standards on the required schedule, the system design's impact on the repeat manufacturability, the proposer's management of any subcontracted manufacturer, and the ability to capture and apply lessons learned for the effective production of subsequent units. This factor also includes assessment of elements such as the relationship of the work to the project schedule, the project element interdependencies (including the resiliency of the production and test schedule to problems appearing in multiple-unit builds, if applicable), the associated schedule margins, and an assessment of the likelihood of meeting the proposed delivery readiness date. Also evaluated under this factor are the proposed project and schedule management tools to be used on the project.

The capability of the management team will be evaluated as a whole, as opposed to assessing the capabilities of each of the Key Team Members independently.

Factor C-5. Adequacy and robustness of the cost plan, including cost feasibility and cost risk. This factor includes elements such as cost, cost risk, cost realism, and cost completeness including assessment of the basis of estimate, the adequacy of the approach used to develop the estimated cost (including how multiple unit builds are costed), *the methods and rationale used to develop the estimated cost*, the discussion of cost risks, the adequacy and allocation of cost reserves by phase, and the scope of work (covering all elements of the mission, including contributions). The adequacy of the cost reserves and understanding of the cost risks will be assessed. This factor also includes an assessment of the proposed cost relative to estimates generated by the evaluation team using parametric models and analogies. *Also evaluated under this factor are the proposed cost management tools to be used on the project.*

Factor C-6. Adequacy of the risk management plan. The adequacy of the proposed risk management approach will be assessed, including any risk mitigation plans for new technologies; any long-lead items; and the adequacy and availability of any required manufacturing, test, or other facilities. *The approach to any proposed descoping of mission capabilities will be assessed.* The management of the risk of contributed critical goods and services will be assessed, including the plans for any international participation, the commitment of partners and contributors, as documented in Letters of Commitment, and the technical adequacy of contingency plans, where they exist, for coping with the failure of a proposed cooperative arrangement or contribution; *when no mitigation is possible, this should be explicitly acknowledged. The stability and reliability of proposed partners, and the appropriateness of any proposed contribution, is not assessed as a management risk but will be assessed by SMD as a programmatic risk element of the investigation.*

Factor C-7. Ground systems. *This factor includes an assessment, including heritage and planned new development, of the proposed operations facilities, hardware, and software (i.e., those for mission operations and science operations), and a telecommunications analysis, ground network capability and utilization plan, and navigation plans.*

Factor C-8. Approach and feasibility for completing Phase B. *This factor includes the completeness of Phase B plans and the adequacy of the Phase B approach. This assessment will*

include evaluation of the activities/products, the organizations responsible for those activities/products, and the schedule to accomplish the activities/products.

Any impact to the primary mission due to the inclusion of SC(s) and/or SEO(s) will also be included in the factors above. Details of the SC and SEO evaluations are given in Section E.7 and Section K.

The panel evaluating the *TMC Feasibility of the Proposed Mission Implementation* may also provide comments to NASA on topics relating to programmatic considerations, for example regarding the size and nature of contributions, the fraction of PIMMC expended prior to KDP C, the flexibility to launch configuration, the extent to which the proposed investigation provides career development opportunities to train the next generation of engineering and management leaders. While these comments will not be considered in the evaluation, they may be considered during down-selection.

D. PROGRAMMATIC VALUE OF THE PROPOSED INVESTIGATION

The DYNAMIC Program Scientist will determine whether there are any changes either to the proposed Baseline and Threshold Science Investigations, or to ongoing and planned projects by NASA, that have emerged in the course of the concept study in such a manner as to have impacted the basis for the evaluation of the *Programmatic Value of the Proposed Investigation* as determined by the peer review panel for the Step-1 proposal. If there are no significant changes to the proposed investigation or to ongoing and planned projects by NASA that undermine the basis of this rating, the peer review panel rating for programmatic value of the Step-1 proposal will be the rating for programmatic value of the CSR. If there are significant changes, the Program Scientist will convene a peer review panel to re-evaluate the *Programmatic Value of the Proposed Investigation* in light of these changes. The factors for re-evaluating this criterion will be the same as those used for the Step-1 proposal review (Section 7.2.5 of the AO).

E. MERIT OF THE STUDENT COLLABORATION AND SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLANS

The following are new evaluation factors that are not described in the AO and therefore were not evaluated for Step-1 proposals. These factors will be evaluated for CSRs.

NASA is providing an SC incentive of 1% of the PIMMC. If the SC cost to NASA is less than the SC incentive, then the proposed SC cost to NASA will be outside of the PIMMC. If the total SC cost exceeds the SC incentive, then the balance of the NASA cost of the SC must be funded within the PIMMC. If the SC costs NASA less than the SC incentive, the project will not receive the balance of the funds up to the full incentive amount. SC resources, as an addition to a mission's implementation, are not available to solve project cost overrun issues. Contributions to the SC are permitted.

Merit of the Student Collaboration, if proposed. This factor will include an assessment of whether the scope of the SC follows the guidelines in Section 5.5.2 of the AO. The criteria to be used to evaluate the SC component and a discussion of those criteria are described in SPD-31

available in the Program Library. If completion of the SC requires a Citizen Science (CS) component, this factor also includes the merit of the Citizen Science Plan including the Engagement and Utilization Plan and the Sunset Plan, for facilitating the contribution of citizen scientists and providing a positive, meaningful CS participant experience.

Merit of the Small Business Subcontracting Plans. This factor will be evaluated on the participation goals and quality and level of work performed by small business concerns overall, as well as that performed by the various categories of small business concerns listed in FAR 52.219-9.

WEIGHTING OF CRITERIA

The percent weighting indicates the approximate relative significance of each evaluation criterion in the Selection Official's consideration:

- A. Scientific merit of the proposed investigation: approximately 18%;
- B. Scientific implementation merit and feasibility of the proposed investigation: approximately 40%;
- C. TMC feasibility of the proposed mission implementation: approximately 40%; and
- D. Programmatic value of the proposed investigation: approximately 2%.

Merit of plans for Small Business Subcontracting, and for an optional Student Collaboration, if proposed, will be evaluated as separate factors and considered during the down-selection process.

ADDITIONAL SELECTION FACTORS

Considering the critical role of the PI, PM, PSE and their institutions, demonstrated capability (especially in meeting cost and schedule constraints in past projects) will be an important factor in the down-selection of an investigation.

In the down-selection process, the Selection Official may consider a wide range of programmatic factors in deciding whether to down-select any CSRs, including, but not limited to, planning and policy considerations, available funding, career development opportunities, programmatic merit and risk of any proposed partnerships, the size and nature of contributions, the distribution of work across NASA Centers and JPL, and maintaining a programmatic and scientific balance across SMD. While SMD develops and evaluates its program strategy in close consultation with the scientific community through a wide variety of groups, SMD programs are evolving activities that ultimately depend upon the most current Administration policies and budgets, as well as program objectives and priorities that can change based on, among other things, new discoveries from ongoing investigations.

PART II – CONCEPT STUDY REPORT OUTLINE AND REQUIREMENTS

Successful implementation of a DYNAMIC investigation demands that the investigation be achievable within established constraints on cost and schedule. The information requested in PART II of this document will enable the evaluation team to assess how well each Concept Study Team understands the complexity of its proposed mission, its technical risks, and any weaknesses that will require specific action during Phase B. Concept Study Teams are cautioned that omissions or inaccurate or inadequate responses to any of the following requirements will negatively affect the overall evaluation.

Requirement CS-1. The CSR shall be written in English and shall employ metric (SI) and/or standard astronomical units, as applicable. It shall contain all data and other information that will be necessary for scientific and technical evaluations; provision by reference to external sources, such as Internet websites, of additional material that is required for evaluation of the CSR is prohibited.

Requirement CS-2. The CSR page size shall be either American standard 8.5 x 11 inches or European standard A4. Foldout pages (11 x 17 inches or A3) may be employed at the proposer's discretion, but see Requirement CS-5 for assessment of foldout pages against the page limit.

Requirement CS-3. The CSR text shall not exceed 5.5 lines per vertical inch (6.5 lines per 3 vertical centimeters) and page numbers shall be specified. Margins at the top, both sides, and bottom of each page shall be no less than 1 inch if formatted for 8.5 x 11-inch paper; no less than 2.5 cm at the top and both sides, and 4 cm at the bottom if formatted for A4 paper. Single-column or double-column formats are acceptable for text pages. Fonts for text and figure captions shall be no smaller than 12-point and no more than 15 characters per horizontal inch (six characters per horizontal centimeter). Fonts used within figures shall be no smaller than 8-point and no more than 10 characters per horizontal inch (4 characters per horizontal centimeter).

Requirement CS-4. CSRs written in their entirety by non-government institutions are not mandated to follow Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) marking instructions. However, CSRs that are written fully or partially by government institutions shall include CUI markings. For those CSRs, it is mandatory to include a banner marking at the top of each page that contains CUI, to alert the reader. For example, pages with export-controlled information would get a "CUI//SP-EXPT" banner. Though not required except for NASA Export Controlled information, portion marking is a highly encouraged and can be accomplished by including a bordered box, as shown in the document *CUI_Portion_Marking_Sample.pdf* in the Program Library. Portion marking can be done according to the proposer's government agency institutional CUI practices or the National Archives and Records Administration CUI Marking Handbook at <https://www.archives.gov/files/cui/documents/20161206-cui-marking-handbook-v1-1-20190524.pdf>.

There are unique challenges when planning for a mission with multiple-build units, which CSRs of such missions will need to address. There are a wide range of issues that are raised by constellation missions which can affect science requirements flow-down, instrument inter-calibration, instrument and spacecraft manufacturing plans (including but not limited to long-lead parts acquisition), systems engineering and configuration management, use of engineering

models or engineering test units, facilities availability and utilization, use of automation, integration and test flow, staffing plans, level of testing, sparing strategy, schedule margins, early on-orbit check-out and routine operations plan, and non-recurring versus recurring costing approaches. Accordingly, this AO allows additional pages for CSRs that include multiple-builds of instrument and/or spacecraft to be included in Sections D, E, F, and G as appropriate.

Requirement CS-5. The CSR shall conform to the page limits specified in the CSR Structure and Page Limits table. A page quota higher than that in the Step-1 proposal has been allotted to accommodate an expected greater maturity of detail.

- Extra pages each are allotted for each separate, non-identical science instrument in the Science Section (Section E); the Auroral Imager, if included, qualifies as an additional separate, non-identical instrument.
- Extra pages are allotted for each separate, non-identical flight element (*e.g.*, spacecraft) in the Mission Implementation and Management Sections (Sections F and G).
- The total number of extra pages allotted for additional science instruments and flight elements in Sections D-H shall not exceed a maximum regardless of the number of non-identical science instruments and flight elements.
- In addition to the extra pages above:
 - Extra pages are allotted across Sections D-H for CSRs that include multiple identical flight units of instruments and/or spacecraft.
 - Extra pages are allotted for all science enhancement options (SEOs) combined, in the Science Implementation Section (Section E). Pages allocated for the proposed SEOs shall not be used for any other purpose; otherwise, where extra pages are allotted in a given section, all pages may be used within that section as the Concept Study Team chooses.
- Every side of a page upon which printing would appear will count against the page limits and, unless specifically exempted (*e.g.*, AO Requirement B-17, Requirement CS-12, Requirement CS-51), each foldout page will count as two pages against the page limits as appropriate for its area (*e.g.*, a foldout with the total area of two standard pages count as two pages, *etc.*). Excess pages will be removed from the end of any applicable Section where the limits have been violated.

Table 2. CSR Structure and Page Limits

Section	Contents	Page Limits
A	Cover Page and Investigation Summary	None, but be brief
B	Fact Sheet and Executive Summary	2 pages for Fact Sheet + 6 pages for Exec. Sum.
C	CSR Table of Contents	None
D	Science Investigation	34 pages (one STM foldout or 2 STM pages do not count)
E F G H	Science Implementation Mission Implementation Management Preliminary Design and Technology Completion (Phase B) Plan	110 pages; + 3 pages for each separate, non-identical instrument*; + 2 pages for each non- identical flight element*; + 10 pages for SEO if proposed**; not including schedule foldouts
E - H	Additional page allocation allowed over Science Implementation, Mission Implementation, and Management sections as needed	+ 4 pages if at least one multiple-build instrument and/or spacecraft is proposed
K	Optional Student Collaboration	5
I J	Cost and Cost Estimating Methodology Justification and Cost Proposal for Any Science Enhancement Option(s)	None, but data must be presented in formats described; be brief
L	CSR Appendices	None, but brevity is encouraged.
L.1	Letters of Commitment and Letters of Support	
L.2	Relevant Experience and Past Performance	
L.3	Resumes	
L.4	Inclusion Plan	
L.5	Phase B Contract Implementation Data	
L.6	Data Management Plan	
L.7	Citizen Science Plan	
L.8	Incentive Plan(s)	
L.9	Technical Content of any International Agreement(s)	
L.10	International Participation Plans (Update from Proposal)	
L.11	Requirements Related to Orbital Debris, Collision Avoidance and End-of-Mission	
L.12	Compliance with Procurement Regulations by NASA PI Proposals.	
L.13	Master Equipment List	
L.14	Heritage	
L.15	Classified Materials.***	
L.16	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	
L.17	Additional Cost Data to Assist Validation (Optional)	
L.18	Science Change Matrix	

L.19	Impact to the Investigation if GDC Data are not Available
L.20	Communications Design Data
L.21	Project Protection
L.22	Cybersecurity
L.23	Draft Mission Definition Requirements Agreement
L.24	Draft MAIP and MAR Compliance Matrix
L.25	Rideshare Accommodation Worksheet
L.26	Storage Plan
L.27	Flexibility to Launch Configuration
L.28	Justification for the use of non-AMMOS MOS/GDS Tools
L.29	Impact of SIS Update (Optional)
L.30	Acronyms and Abbreviations List
L.31	References and Management Standards List

* Total extra pages are limited to 20 regardless of the number of non-identical science instruments and flight elements.

** Pages allocated for the proposed SEO(s) shall not be used for any other purpose.

*** Submitted separately.

Requirement CS-6. The CSR shall consist of unlocked, bookmarked, searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file(s) including the main body of the CSR, all tables, and all applicable CSR appendices (see Section L). The CSR shall consist of no more than two volumes divided into readily identifiable sections. Each file should be no larger than 120 MB for ease of display and navigation. If two volumes are submitted, the second volume should contain the cost proposal (Section I) and any cost appendices (*e.g.* L.5, L.8, L.17) and the first volume should contain the remainder of Sections A-L. Images (*e.g.*, figures and scans) shall be converted into machine-encoded text using optical character recognition. Audio, video, or embedded animations shall not be included. Links to other parts of the CSR are permitted, but links to materials outside of the CSR are not.

Requirement CS-7. The CSR submission shall include the CSR file(s) specified in Requirement CS-6, and shall additionally include the electronic files listed below.

- Final list of CSR participants in MS-Excel format (Requirement CS-9)

In addition, the augmented submission shall include the electronic files listed below, by the deadline for augmented submissions:

- Trajectory supplement, if applicable (Requirement CS-38)
- Schedule in MS-Project format (Requirement CS-52)
- MEL in MS-Excel format (Requirement CS-129)
- Rideshare Accommodation spreadsheet (Requirement CS-146)
- Program and Project Management Standard References, if applicable (Requirement CS-152)
- All Cost Tables in MS-Excel format (Requirement CS-90, Requirement CS-91 and Requirement CS-97)
- Excel spreadsheets or model files to accompany the additional cost data to assist in validation, if applicable (See Section L.17 of this document)

Requirement CS-8. The Concept Study Team shall redact all materials in the CSR submission identified as containing export-controlled material, per Section 5.8.4 of the AO. The Concept Study Team shall redact these materials into separate versions of files that are collected in a “Redacted” folder.

Requirement CS-9. The Concept Study Team shall provide a list of the individuals who have participated in the concept study (*e.g.*, individuals who worked on the CSR, any CSR contributor, Red Team member, reviewer, *etc.*) and/or whom they are proposing to provide work should the mission be down-selected. Additionally, the Study Team shall provide a list of all organizations named in the CSR, or providing developmental or research services, including the lead organization, subcontractors, vendors and contributing organizations who have an interest in the mission. The Study Team shall provide the draft list of the participants as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet document to the point-of-contact (POC, see AO Section 6.1.5) three months prior to the due date of the CSR, using the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet template in the Program Library. This list is to be updated and a final revision shall be included in a separate electronic file at the time of CSR submission.

The purpose of this requirement is to avoid placing people on the CSR evaluation team who have conflicts of interest. One of the objectives of this requirement is to obtain a list of organizations and individuals who would otherwise be unknown to NASA as having or causing a conflict, *e.g.*, independent consultants or consulting organizations who helped with the CSR, or academic colleagues who were Red Team members for the CSR.

Requirement CS-10. The Concept Study Team shall create a separate document that contains a table with all of the requirements (Requirement CS-1 through Requirement CS-153) and the page, section, or table number that is the main place in the CSR where the requirement is addressed. Study Teams shall provide this table as a PDF document to the point-of-contact for the AO by email no later than seven calendar days after the CSRs are due.

Requirement CS-11. The Concept Study Team shall electronically submit the CSR and all required and optional files by the deadlines specified in the Introduction section, via the NASA Box service, which is Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 140-2 certified for Data-in-Transit (DIT) and Data-at-Rest (DAR). To submit their CSR and the associated files through Box, the Study Team shall provide an email list of no more than three (3) individuals requiring access to Box to submit files. This email list shall be provided to the POC no less than fourteen calendar days before the CSRs are due. NASA will email the individuals on the list an invitation with a secure link to Box. The Concept Study Team is encouraged to submit a test file using the secure link to Box to ensure functionality prior to CSR submittal.

The required uniform format and contents of the CSR are detailed below. Failure to follow this outline may impede the evaluation process.

A. COVER PAGE AND INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

Requirement CS-12. A Graphic Cover Page and Summary Information, prepared as directed below, shall preface the CSR. These pages will not be counted against the page limits.

Requirement CS-13. The Graphic Cover Page shall contain, at a minimum, the following information and elements displayed on the cover page of the CSR:

- The investigation title;
- The name of the proposing organization;
- The name of the PI;
- The name and title of an official who is authorized to commit the proposing organization through the submission of the CSR;
- The images of signatures of the PI and the authorizing official (unless these signatures appear on the CSR Summary Information).

Optionally, the Graphic Cover page may also contain:

- Any illustrations or graphic elements of the proposer's choice; and
- Any additional information of the proposer's choice that is nonproprietary and that does not provide additional content beyond what is in the CSR.

Requirement CS-14. The following Summary Information shall be included in this Section:

- Names and institutions of all participants in the investigation;
- The Enhanced PI-Managed Mission Cost of the investigation (\$FY2023);
- The proposed contributions and contributing organizations, and
- A summary of the investigation, not to exceed 300 words. The CSR Summary shall not contain proprietary or confidential information that the submitters wish to protect from public disclosure.

Requirement CS-15. If the CSR contains export-controlled material, the following Export Controlled Material Statement shall be prominently displayed in Section A of the CSR (following the Graphic Cover Page and Summary Information):

“The information (data) contained in [insert page numbers or other identification] of this proposal is (are) subject to U.S. export laws and regulations. It is furnished to the Government with the understanding that it will not be exported without the prior approval of the proposer under the terms of an applicable export license or technical assistance agreement. The identified information (data) is (are) printed in a red font and figure(s) and table(s) containing the identified information (data) is (are) placed in a red-bordered box.”

It is the proposer's responsibility to determine whether any CSR information is subject to the provisions of ITAR or EAR. Information regarding U.S. export regulations is available at https://www.pmddtc.state.gov/ddtc_public and <http://www.bis.doc.gov/>.

Proposers should be aware that the evaluators of *Scientific Implementation Merit and Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation* (Criterion B) will review the version of the CSR in which any export-controlled material has been redacted (see Requirement CS-8).

B. FACT SHEET AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement CS-16. The CSR shall include a fact sheet that provides a brief summary of the investigation. Information conveyed on this fact sheet shall include:

- Science objectives (including the importance of the science to the program science goals);
- Mission overview;
- Instrument complement (including Auroral Imager, if accommodated);
- Key spacecraft characteristics;
- Project management and participating organizations (including teaming arrangements and all named key personnel);
- Schedule summary;
- The proposed PIMMC in Real Year dollars (RY\$) and in Fiscal Year 2023 dollars (FY23\$) from *Cost Table Template 1*; and
- The proposed Total Cost, including a breakdown of any contributed costs by contributing organization, in RY\$ and in FY23\$ from *Cost Table Template 2*.

Requirement CS-17. The Executive Summary shall summarize the contents of the CSR and shall include an overview of the proposed baseline investigation, including its scientific objectives, technical approach, management plan, cost estimate, SC (if proposed), and small business subcontracting plans.

C. CSR TABLE OF CONTENTS

Requirement CS-18. The CSR shall contain a Table of Contents that parallels the outline provided in Sections D through L below. A separate index of figures and tables shall also be included.

See the *CSR Structure and Page Limits* table above (Table 2) for page limits on Sections D through L.

D. SCIENCE INVESTIGATION

Requirement CS-19. The Science Investigation section shall describe the science investigation as specified by Requirements B-16 through B-19 in Appendix B of the AO. If there are no changes from the Step-1 proposal, including no Form A or D Potential Major Weakness (PMW) clarifications, this section shall be reproduced identically from the Step-1 proposal, with a statement that there have been no changes. Such a statement may be inserted before the first page of this section or it may be included in Appendix L.18 of the CSR. Any updates to the original (submitted) Step-1 proposal section (including those made in response to Step-1 Form A and D PMW clarifications) shall be incorporated in the Science Investigation section of the CSR.

Requirement CS-20. The Science Investigation section shall identify any changes to the Baseline and Threshold Science Investigations defined in the original (submitted) Step-1 proposal and shall provide the rationale for the change(s). Such changes to the science

investigation shall be highlighted via typographic emphasis (*e.g.*, bold, italics) and/or font color, with column marking for easy identification. In addition, for any change affecting science objectives, the research plan, or their associated requirements, a change matrix is required as an appendix (see Section L.18 of this document) to show the original (submitted Step-1 proposal) text, any new or revised text, rationale for the change(s), and location(s) within the CSR. Corrections (*e.g.*, typos, incorrect references) and nominal updates (*e.g.*, revised references, clarified sentences) to this section, that do not constitute a change to the proposed science investigation (*i.e.*, no change to science objectives, research plan, data sets, requirements, implementation details, measurements, data sets, *etc.*) are not required to be individually identified and tracked; however, a summary of such changes shall be provided.

Science Change Matrix Example, available in the Program Library, provides an example format for Appendix L.18 (under “Entries in Science Change Matrix”). This format documents Section D changes and provides rationale for those changes.

E. SCIENCE IMPLEMENTATION

E.1. Level 1 and Level 2 Requirements

The Level 1 requirements identify the mission, science, and programmatic requirements and constraints imposed on the project. Consistent with NPR 7120.5, both baseline and threshold requirements are to be described. Baseline requirements are those necessary to achieve the science objectives of the Baseline Science Investigation. Threshold requirements are those necessary to achieve the science objectives of the Threshold Science Investigation, as defined in AO Section D.3.

The Level 1 requirements define the key scientific determinations and/or results that would represent completion of the investigation science objectives. These requirements do not specify any particular mission implementation (including mission capabilities) but must decompose into the project’s Level 2 (mission implementation) requirements. They are achieved through the analysis of the investigation’s anticipated data sets, as defined by the investigation research plan. When the Level 1 requirements are all met, the project will have provided the expected return on NASA’s investment even with no further mission operations or scientific analysis. The Level 1 requirements may also identify additional requirements or constraints beyond those necessary for the science investigation (*e.g.*, returned sample curation, NASA-added access to space constraints). Level 1 requirements are referred to as program-level requirements (in NPR 7120.5) and are controlled by NASA.

Level 2 requirements define the first level of project-specific mission implementation requirements. They specify requirements and constraints on scientific measurements, mission and spacecraft performance, prime mission lifetime, and any other project requirements or constraints that need to be controlled. The Level 2 requirements flow down from and flow up to the Level 1 requirements: for example, Level 2 requirements, when completed together, deliver the full investigation data sets that enable the scientific analysis necessary to complete the

science Level 1 requirements. Level 2 requirements are referred to as project-level requirements and are controlled by the project.

The Level 1 requirements are criteria used to evaluate whether a project should be called for a termination review (in the case of degraded project performance) and the level of scientific success against the investigation objectives (as part of project closeout). The Program Library provides examples of Level 1 requirements (within the Program Level Requirements Appendix (PLRA) documents), examples of Level 2 requirements (within the Mission Definition Requirements Agreement [MDRA] documents), and presentation slides on Level 1 and Level 2 requirements given at the PI Masters Forums (<https://soma.larc.nasa.gov/pi-masters-forums/>).

Requirement CS-21. The CSR shall provide a set of proposed Level 1 requirements and a set of proposed Level 2 requirements. Both baseline and threshold Level 1 requirements shall be identified. The Level 1 science requirements shall be scientific determinations and/or results clearly traceable to the science objectives and sufficient to represent completion of the science objectives. The Level 2 requirements shall be adequate, sufficient, and complete to guide the design, development, and operation of the mission. Lower-level requirements shall be provided to the extent that they are known and necessary to explain and justify the design concept including instrument capability, instrument performance, and other aspects of the system architecture that enable the accomplishment of the investigation objectives. The requirements shall be stated in unambiguous, objective, quantifiable, and verifiable terms. Requirements shall not conflict with each other. The Level 1 requirements shall be listed in this section. The Level 2 requirements shall be listed in Appendix L.23, Draft Mission Definition Requirements Agreement (MDRA).

E.2. Science Mission Profile

Requirement CS-22. This section shall discuss the science observing profile, including all mission-relevant parameters, such as orbit, navigation accuracy, operational timelines (including observing periods, data transmission periods and techniques, and time-critical events), *etc.* The science observation strategy shall also be described in sufficient detail to understand the complexity of science operations, *i.e.*, are the operations regular re-iteration of data collection sequences, thereby establishing a routine flow, or are there numerous, uniquely planned events thereby requiring repeated planning, testing, and upload cycles. The observation planning and decision-making processes shall be outlined including any priorities assigned to specific observations or measurements and any plans to update the observing strategy based on early observations. The schedule and workforce associated with science planning shall also be described. If science operations involve an ebb and flow of personnel to reduce costs during cruise or “quiet” phases, this section shall describe plans for maintaining sufficient trained personnel and for how they will be moved off and then back on the project. The manner in which the proposed investigation objectives, measurement requirements, and selected instruments, drive the proposed mission design and operations plan shall be included in this discussion.

E.3. Instrumentation

Requirement CS-23. This section shall describe the instrumentation and the rationale for its selection. It shall identify instrument systems (*i.e.*, individual instruments), instrument subsystems, instrument components, and sample collection and preservation system as applicable, including their characteristics and requirements, and indicate items that are proposed for development, as well as any existing instrumentation or design/flight heritage. It shall provide a clear understanding of how the proposed instrumentation will provide the required data, show how it can be accommodated by the spacecraft, demonstrate that instruments have the necessary unobstructed fields-of-view over the measurement period required, describe the technology readiness levels and the approach to bring each instrument to Technology Readiness Level (TRL) 6 by Preliminary Design Review (PDR). If no development plan is needed, the reasons for this shall be explicitly stated and the rationale shall be described. A preliminary description of each instrument design, with a block diagram showing the instrument subsystems and components, and their interfaces, along with a description of the estimated performance of the instrument, including the assumptions made in deriving the estimated performance, shall be included. These performance characteristics (which shall be considered as requirements on the flight system) shall include mass, power, volume, data rate(s), thermal, pointing (such as control, stability, jitter, drift, accuracy, *etc.*), spatial and spectral resolution, observable precision, retrieved parameter sensitivity and accuracy, and calibration requirements. This section shall demonstrate that the instrumentation can meet the measurement requirements, including factors such as retrieval results for each remote-sensing instrument, error analysis of the information in all sensors, vertical and horizontal resolution, signal-to-noise (S/N) calculations, *etc.* It shall also discuss environmental effects, such as radiation (including Total Ionizing Dose [TID], Total Non-Ionizing Dose [NTID], and Single Event Effects [SEE]), temperature, and contamination, on each instrument's measurement capabilities as a function of mission time.

Requirement CS-24. The following information shall be provided for each science instrument proposed:

1. Mass (include lower-level breakouts);
2. Viewing direction(s) in body coordinates;
3. Pointing accuracy and stability requirements;
4. Operational modes;
5. Operational mode timeline;
6. Data demand for each instrument operational mode;
7. Onboard data processing and storage required from spacecraft;
8. Power demand for each instrument operational mode including peak, average, and stand-by power;
9. Instrument thermal control capability;
10. Applicable instrument diagrams (*e.g.*, optical path); and
11. Characteristics of relevant instrument components (*e.g.*, listing of size of optics) in the MEL.

E.4. Data Sufficiency

Requirement CS-25. This section shall discuss the quality and quantity of instrument observations delivered and processed, as they relate to the proposed science investigation goals and objectives. The section shall demonstrate the degree to which the measurement techniques and mission can provide the necessary measurements, and demonstrate the sufficiency of the data sets generated to complete the scientific investigation. The flow-down from science investigation goals to measurement objectives and instrument performance shall be stated clearly and supported by quantitative analysis.

E.5. Analysis, Data and Software Plans

Requirement CS-26. This section shall describe a Data Analysis Plan including approaches for data retrieval, validation, and preliminary analysis. The science products (*e.g.*, flight data, ancillary or calibration data, theoretical calculations, higher order analytical or data products, laboratory data, *etc.*) shall be identified, including a list of the specific data products and the individual team members responsible for the data products.

As a Federal agency, NASA requires prompt public disclosure of the results of its sponsored research to generate knowledge that benefits the Nation. Thus, it is NASA's intent that all knowledge developed under awards resulting from this solicitation be shared broadly.

Requirement CS-27. This section shall describe a Data Management Plan (DMP), including approaches for the release of peer-reviewed publications, the release of the science data that underlie the results and findings in peer-reviewed publications, and the archiving of all science; a schedule-based end-to-end draft of the Data Management Plan shall be provided in Appendix L.6. The plan shall be in compliance with requirements and the guidelines in the *NASA Plan for Increasing Access to the Results of Scientific Research*, with the applicable version of SPD-41 and with the *Heliophysics Division Science Data Management Policy*, or a justification shall be provided that this is not necessary given the nature of the work proposed. This section shall identify the science products (*e.g.*, flight data, ancillary or calibration data, theoretical calculations, higher order analytical or data products, laboratory data, *etc.*), including a list of the specific data products and the individual team members responsible for the data products. The DMP description shall include a discussion and justification of any data latency period. This section shall identify the calibration and measurement algorithm document, including a list of the individual team members responsible for the document.

Requirement CS-28. This section shall describe a Software Management Plan covering the scientific software and tools to be developed (including their current status), the software and tool documentation, the planned release under a permissive or less restrictive open-source license from inception, the open repository planned for use, the process for testing and management, and the individual team members responsible for the software and tools; a schedule-based end-to-end draft of the Software Management Plan shall be provided in Appendix L.6.

E.6. Science Team

Requirement CS-29. This section shall describe the organizational structure and management approach for the science team and its execution of the investigation, including the identification of each member and their roles and responsibilities. The role of the PI and each Co-investigator (Co-I) shall be explicitly defined, and the necessity of each Co-I role shall be justified. The role of each collaborator shall be described and justified. The funding source (NASA or contributed) for each science team member shall be noted.

Requirement CS-30. If applicable, this section shall discuss how the investigation science team will interface and collaborate with individuals and organizations that are outside of the PI-assembled science team but are connected to the project by the discussions in AO Sections 5.1.2 (and sub-sections), 5.9.4 and 5.9.5 (*e.g.*, GDC Project Scientist, Auroral Imager science team).

Requirement CS-31. A summary table shall be included, with columns for

1. Science team member name;
2. their roles and responsibilities on the mission; and
3. their time commitment, in Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) or Work Year Equivalents (WYEs), for each mission Phase, A through F (as specified in Requirement CS-92 to Requirement CS-95).

E.7. Plan for SEO

Requirement CS-32. If an SEO is proposed, this section shall define and describe plans for the proposed activities (see Section 5.1.5 of the AO). The SEO shall be directly related to the mission (*i.e.*, analyze mission data, not enhance theory). The SEO shall be clearly separable from the Baseline Science Investigation and Threshold Science Investigation. Additionally, a justification and a cost plan for SEO activities are required in Section J of this document.

F. MISSION IMPLEMENTATION

The goal of this section is to demonstrate the feasibility of the mission implementation designed to meet the scientific objectives of the investigation, at a level sufficient to demonstrate maturity consistent with the end of Phase A, and to provide a complete scope for scheduling and cost bases. To this end, each section should explicitly address the unique and driving aspects of the mission implementation, such as (where applicable): multiple-builds and constellation management, design for rideshare launch opportunity, accommodation of Auroral Imager, interfaces with external organizations, *etc.*

F.1. General Requirements and Mission Traceability.

Requirement CS-33. This section shall provide a description of the spaceflight mission that is proposed to enable the science investigation.

In some areas (*e.g.*, instruments), the data requested may have already been presented in another section of the CSR (*e.g.*, the Science Implementation section). In such a case, a CSR may provide a reference to that section and need not repeat the data in this section.

Requirement CS-34. This section shall provide the Key Driving Requirements (KDR) that the science goals and objectives impose on the mission design elements, including mission design, instrument accommodation, driving environments, spacecraft design, required launch vehicle capability, ground systems, communications approach, and mission operations plan, in tabular form and supported by narrative discussion. Table B2 provides an example of a tabular Mission Traceability Matrix (MTM), with examples of matrix elements. Specific information that describes how the science investigation imposes unique requirements on these mission design elements shall be included.

This MTM, along with the STM in Table B1, provides the reference points and tools needed to track overall mission requirements, provides systems engineers with fundamental requirements needed to design the mission, shows clearly the effects of any descoping or losses of mission elements, and facilitates identification of any resulting degradation to the science.

F.2. Mission Concept Descriptions.

Requirement CS-35. This section shall describe designs for all elements of the mission in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the proposed concept meets all of the basic requirements for a space flight mission, including mission design, spacecraft design, and supporting mission operations and ground systems. Discussion of how the various mission elements meet the Key Driving Requirements shall be included. At a minimum, the following mission elements shall be addressed: mission design, flight system capabilities including instrument accommodation, mission operations, ground systems, and any additional elements. It shall also discuss environmental effects, such as radiation (including Total Ionizing Dose [TID], Total Non-Ionizing Dose [NTID], and Single Event Effects [SEE]), temperature, and contamination, on the flight systems.

Requirement CS-36. Mission Design: This section shall address the following elements of mission design to the extent that they are applicable to the proposed mission. Any additional elements that are applicable to explaining the mission and demonstrating its feasibility shall also be addressed.

1. Delivery readiness date;
2. Delivery date flexibility;
3. Mission duration;
4. Orbit type (Earth orbit, heliocentric, *etc.*) and orbit information (semimajor axis, eccentricity, inclination, node time of day, argument of perigee, altitude, allowable dispersions), and/or trajectory design, and trajectory parameters for ballistic and low-thrust trajectories to permit independent validation, as applicable to the proposed investigation;
5. Critical events, which includes LV separation telemetry (per NPR 8705.4 Appendix D);
6. Telecomm link summary for all communication modes (based on requirements identified in Appendix L.20, *Communications Design Data*);

7. Ground station(s) usage (e.g., location(s) and transmitting and receiving communication parameters); and
8. Space system's fault management approach and design.

As described in AO Section 5.9.2., the DYNAMIC flight system design must be compatible with rideshare launch as specified in the DYNAMIC *System Interface Specification* (SIS) document in the Program Library, consistent with a GFE access to space utilizing Rideshare on Government Primary launches. The DYNAMIC SIS has been updated for Step 2.

Requirement CS-37. Launch Services and Launch Vehicle Compatibility: compatibility with the proposed access to space service shall be demonstrated by providing in the appropriate CSR sections the approach to meeting all key SIS requirements, to include: the spacecraft dimensions with margins to allowable volumes in the DYNAMIC SIS document; spacecraft mass; first fixed-free fundamental frequency; mission orbit characteristics such as altitude (km—circular or apogee/perigee), inclination, C3, heliocentric and/or declination (DLA); and delta-v allocated for achieving the mission orbit from any injection orbit within the range specified in the SIS document. Any nonstandard requirements such as additional fairing doors, cleanliness and purge requirements, planetary protection, *etc.* shall be described. The packaged flight system in the proposed fairing, with critical clearance dimensions, and preliminary estimates of launch loads and structural margins shall be included.

A completed copy of the *Rideshare Accommodation worksheet* template from the Program Library must be provided as an appendix (see Appendix L.25). The *Rideshare Accommodation worksheet* template has been updated for Step 2.

While it is not baselined, AO Section 5.9.2 also lists a programmatic alternative that would use Launch Services Program (LSP) Venture-Class Acquisition of Dedicated and Rideshare (VADR) Launch Services, which could include dedicated launch options. Compatibility with this option is not required but provides programmatic flexibility (see Appendix L.27).

Requirement CS-38. Trajectory for Electric Propulsion: For any mission using Electric Propulsion to achieve orbit, the following information shall be provided in a file or files along with the CSR submission as part of a trajectory supplement. Any graphical references, tables, figures, *etc.* shall be presented in a minimum of 150 dots per inch (dpi).

1. Checkout Duration: The minimum duration allocated after launch before the primary propulsion system will be commanded to provide required delta-v.
2. Initial Mass Assumptions: Provide the initial mass used for generation of the trajectories including propellant loading assumptions.
3. Event Basics: Provide the date/time of each trajectory event with a brief event description (e.g., Launch, Gravity Assist, Fly-by, Rendezvous, Mid-Course Burn) and the appropriate data for the event (e.g., flyby altitude, flyby angle, flyby/intercept velocity, delta-v magnitude).
4. EP Throttling Model: Provide the throttling model used to generate EP engine performance at any point during the trajectory and a brief explanation of the approach.
5. Assumed Engine Duty Cycle: Provide the overall Duty Cycle for the EP engines and if applicable provide the duty cycle over each trajectory segment.

6. Number of Engines: Provide the maximum number of engines on the spacecraft that could be operating simultaneously. In addition, provide the number of engines operating throughout each phase of the trajectory.
7. Any other trajectory specific information not called out above that would be relevant to reviewers attempting to validate the EP aspects of the trajectory and orbit, should also be included.

Requirement CS-39. Flight System Capabilities: This section shall address the following flight system capabilities, to the extent that they are applicable to the proposed mission, accounting for the environmental effects such as radiation, temperature, and contamination. Any additional elements that are applicable to explaining the mission and demonstrating its feasibility shall also be addressed. Note that the heritage of the components and subsystems are to be discussed in Appendix L.14.

1. Spacecraft Parameters:
 - a. Figure of the complete spacecraft/instrument system on the launch vehicle and in flight with major components labeled and approximate overall dimensions.
 - b. Block diagram of the spacecraft subsystems and their components.
2. Subsystem descriptions including structure, telecommunications, thermal, power, propulsion (if required), attitude determination and control, command and data handling, in-flight fault management, and flight software. (Note that the discussion of the telecommunications subsystem should be limited to specifications, design, and proposed component hardware—discussion of the link performance is addressed as part of Appendix L.19). Subsystem detail shall include the following information:
 - a. Propulsion, including
 - i. a list of all specific events of the proposed delta-v budget (including 3-sigma values for stochastic maneuvers);
 - ii. for each propulsion mode propulsion type(s) (monopropellant, bi-propellant, dual-mode, solar electric, *etc.*), engines and thrust levels, and specific impulse;
 - iii. propellant allocation (impulse *vs.* attitude control system); and
 - iv. propellant margin, including nominal (to meet delta-v requirement) and additional (to meet mass growth).
 - b. Command and Data Handling, including
 - i. spacecraft housekeeping data rates for nominal and safing strategy;
 - ii. data storage unit size (Mbits); and
 - iii. maximum storage record and playback rate.
 - c. Power, solar-powered missions:
 - i. expected power requirement and margins for each operational mission phase;
 - ii. type of array structure (rigid, flexible, body mounted);
 - iii. solar array axes of rotation (vector projected in spacecraft coordinates);
 - iv. array size;
 - v. solar cell type and efficiency;

- vi. expected power generation at Beginning of Life and End of Life;
 - vii. worst case Sun incidence angle to solar panels for each operational mission phase;
 - viii. battery type, storage capacity, and expected degradation;
 - ix. phased and worst-case battery Depth of Discharge (DOD);
 - x. spacecraft bus voltage.
- d. Attitude Determination and Control, including system pointing requirements and capabilities. Describe or define the following:
- i. each spacecraft operational mode, including the sensors and actuators used, control method, and safing and/or contingency modes;
 - ii. attitude determination methodology and estimate of accuracy, including identifying whether ground post-processing is required to meet science needs;
 - iii. agility requirements for slews or scanning;
 - iv. appendage pointing requirements, including articulation control methods and deployment accommodations;
 - v. sensor selection and performance, including identifying mounting location and field-of-view (FOV);
 - vi. actuator selection and sizing, including identifying mounting location(s);
 - vii. translational maneuver (Δv) control and accuracy;
 - viii. momentum management approach and mitigation of impacts on navigation accuracy, if applicable;
 - ix. on-orbit calibrations, if required, including expected accuracy; and
 - x. attitude control requirements for the spacecraft pointing control, pointing knowledge (at the instrument interface), pointing stability, or jitter.
- e. Thermal control, including:
- i. temperature requirements including allowable temperature ranges;
 - ii. temperature control approach (*i.e.*, passive vs. active);
 - iii. cooling loads; and
 - iv. special thermal design considerations (*e.g.*, cryogenic instrument requirements).
- f. Structures, including:
- i. requirements;
 - ii. governing load cases and margins;
 - iii. chosen materials; and
 - iv. their qualification testing.
- g. Flight software, including:
- i. a description of the software architecture including the operating system, development language, and the major software modules to a sufficient depth to demonstrate how this software architecture supports the proposed mission functions;
 - ii. the logical lines of code by Computer Software Configuration Item (CSCI) and the basis for these estimates;
 - iii. a description of the functionality for each CSCI;
 - iv. code counts categorized as either New, Modified, Full Reuse, or Autogenerated;
 - v. development method (spiral, waterfall, agile, *etc.*);

- vi. the development approach for any major new algorithms to be incorporated in the flight software; and
- vii. the approach for interface management and plans for software verification and validation.

Requirement CS-40. Additional Mission Elements: This section shall address any other major mission elements (*e.g.*, lander, upper stage, *etc.*) to the extent that they are applicable to the proposed mission. Any additional elements that are applicable to explaining the mission and demonstrating its feasibility shall also be discussed.

- Provide a block diagram and description of relevant subsystems; and
- Demonstrate that the proposed design can accomplish the mission within the allocated resources.

Requirement CS-41. Flight System Contingencies and Margins: This section shall summarize contingencies and margins of all key flight systems resources. It shall provide the Study Team's assessment of the maximum possible value for each key resource for the proposed mission, estimates of implementation performance, and resulting design margins with respect to the required performance. At a minimum, it shall include the following:

1. Dry Mass;
2. Launch Mass useable by the proposed mission;
3. Propellants;
4. Power (including energy storage);
5. CPU utilization;
6. Data (including storage and downlink volume);
7. Attitude Control; and
8. Any other driving mission element requirements derived from the Key Driving Requirements.

See the table following Requirement B-38 of the AO for definitions of contingency and margin.

Requirement CS-42. Mission Operations: This section shall address, at a minimum, the following elements of mission operations and communication to the extent they are applicable to the proposed mission. Any additional elements that are applicable to explaining the mission operations and demonstrating their feasibility shall also be addressed.

1. Operational concept that includes the following:
 - a. Operational Scenarios with a description of each mission phase from launch through end of mission including an integrated description of the ground, spacecraft, and instrument events.
 - b. Timelines for each mission phase; containing spacecraft, instrument complement, and ground events, as well as ground processing and timeline margins.
 - c. Data flow diagrams which clearly show the major operational facilities and key software components utilized for both the uplink and downlink processes.
 - d. A Phase E Organization diagram and Team Responsibilities clearly indicating the key manager for each of the project facilities in the data flow diagram, including the Mission Operations Center (MOC) and Science Operations Center (SOC).

- e. Interface between the Flight Operations Team and the Conjunction Assessment Risk Analysis (CARA) team at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC).
2. Description of ground systems and facilities, including:
 - a. Supporting ground software at the MOC and at the SOC required for development, testing, and operations;
 - b. Identification of the heritage of each project facility including the software and hardware within that facility and the identification of the percentage of new, modified or no changes for each major software element;
 - c. A plan for required maintenance and refresh of vendor supplied ground systems (hardware and software) during extended cruise operations, if applicable; and
 - d. A plan for retention of adequate development and test resources, spacecraft models and Ground Support Equipment (GSE), test beds, *etc.* during Phase E that addresses the impact of operations development and testing on routine and contingency mission operations.
 3. Telecommunications, Tracking, and Navigation including:
 - a. downlink information and data volume;
 - b. uplink information;
 - c. for all transmit and receive modes: mode timeline, data rate(s), durations, and planning for compliance with spectrum limitations, including compliance with maximum channel bandwidth;
 - d. ground network utilization plan including ground stations, downlink parameters (frequencies, periods, capacities, margins, *etc.*), and retransmission capability; and
 - e. approach for acquiring and returning data, including clear identification of procurement and costing for supplemental resources (*e.g.*, mobile ground stations) if such are needed.
 4. Operations plan feasibility, including:
 - a. operations center development;
 - b. team training and availability of spacecraft experts for operations; and
 - c. a quantitative discussion of nominal sequence planning and commanding showing the ability of the Mission Operations and Ground Data System (GDS) to analyze the spacecraft and instrument data and to generate the necessary sequences to enable the spacecraft to meet the planned mission timelines.

For missions proposing the use of NASA network facilities, a Letter of Commitment from the NASA network provider describing the network's ability to deliver the required capabilities and capacities and the cost for doing so must be included in Appendix L.1. Where the use of NASA's network services may not be within the capabilities and capacities described in the NASA's Mission Operations and Communications Services document, early discussions should be initiated with the POC named in that document.

Requirement CS-43. This section shall provide a clear statement of NASA Space Communication and Navigation (SCaN) network support requirements in tabular format. The table shall show all mission phases (*e.g.*, launch and early orbital operations, cruise, flybys, orbit insertion, orbital operations, data return), the year in which support is needed, station(s) required,

pass lengths, number of passes each week, and the number of weeks for which this support is required.

F.3. Development Approach

The CSR must describe how all development challenges, including those associated with new technology, will be addressed. The development approach discussions must include roles and responsibilities and should focus on any unique aspects of the proposed mission that pose unusual challenges.

Requirement CS-44. This section shall describe the development plan. This description shall include the following items:

1. The systems engineering approach shall be specifically discussed, including the definition, flow-down, tracking, control, and verification of design requirements; resource allocation and control; interface requirements; and hardware and software configuration control. The discussion of the systems engineering approach shall include roles and responsibilities and any unique aspects of the proposed mission that pose unusual system engineering challenges;
2. Identification of instrument to spacecraft interfaces, as well as roles and responsibilities for the interface management process as specified in NPR 7123.1;
3. Essential trade studies completed in Phase A, including considered options and conclusions;
4. Essential trade studies to be conducted in Phase B, including considered options and driving requirements;
5. Identification of the key Technical Performance Measures (TPMs)—as specified in NPR 7123.1—and descriptions of how margins are to be allocated, tracked, and monitored, with what tools and by whom, and who will have the authority to release the associated margins;
6. Descriptions of when contracts are required, the acquisition strategy, including any incentive strategy;
7. Management and closure of action items, hardware discrepancies, test anomalies, *etc.*; and
8. Plan for handling special processes.

Requirement CS-45. This section shall describe the software engineering development approach. This description shall include the following items:

1. Roles and responsibilities for the software management process—as specified in NPR 7150.2—and product development responsibilities;
2. A description of how the flight and ground software will be developed and maintained;
3. Software assurance approach;
4. Identification of the key technical resource metrics—as specified in NPR 7150.2—and associated margins allocation, tracking and management;
5. Description of static analysis to be used during the software development and testing; and
6. Software coding standard to be used for each of the software programming languages being used on the project.

Requirement CS-46. This section shall describe the plan for mission assurance, including product assurance, reliability and approach to mitigating the effects of radiation. Any impacts to the concept of operations, lifetime and fault management due to parts selection shall be addressed. Plans for using reliability tools, such as fault tree analysis, probabilistic risk assessments, and failure modes and effects analyses, shall be described. Other mission assurance activities such as fault tolerance, reliability (*e.g.*, use or non-use of redundancy, requirements for burn-in of parts, and requirements for total operating time without failure prior to flight) shall be described. Processes for identifying and tracking the correction of failures, both hardware and software, from the piece part to the system level shall be described. This section shall also describe the proposed policies and procedures for parts selection, screening, and usage for each developer.

Requirement CS-47. This section shall indicate any expected tailoring from the recommended mission assurance requirements in Appendix C of NPR 8705.4 for Class D. Tailoring below the *SMD Standard Mission Assurance Requirements for Payload Classification D* (SMD Policy Document SPD-39) shall not be proposed, even for individual flight elements within a constellation. The section shall describe the proposed management approach to ensuring Safety and Mission Assurance (S&MA) practices at all partner and hardware institutions will meet the needs of the mission. The section shall discuss any enhancement of the S&MA requirements necessary and appropriate for the proposed mission.

F.4. New Technologies/Advanced Engineering Developments.

Requirement CS-48. This section shall describe any proposed new technologies and/or advanced engineering developments and the approaches that will be taken to reduce associated risks. Descriptions shall address, at a minimum, the following topics:

1. Identification and justification of the TRL for each proposed system (level 3 WBS instrument developments and level 3 WBS spacecraft elements) incorporating new technology and/or advanced engineering development at the time the CSR is submitted (for TRL definitions, see NPR 7123.1, NASA Systems Engineering Processes and Requirements, Appendix E);
2. Rationale for combining the TRL values of components and subsystems to derive each full system TRL as proposed, appropriately considering TRL states of integration (see NASA Systems Engineering Handbook);
3. Rationale for the stated TRL value of an element that is an adaptation of an existing element of known TRL;
4. The approach for maturing each of the proposed systems to a minimum of TRL 6 by PDR:
 - a. Demonstration (testing) in a relevant environment can be accomplished at the system level or at lower level(s);
 - b. If applicable, justify what demonstration(s) in a relevant environment at lower level(s) (subsystem and/or subsystem-to-subsystem) would be sufficient to meet system level TRL 6, considering:

- i. where any new technology is to be inserted,
 - ii. the magnitude of engineering development to integrate elements,
 - iii. any inherent interdependencies between elements (e.g., critical alignments), and/or
 - iv. the complexity of interfaces—see the Program Library for examples; and
 - c. Include discussion of simulations, prototyping, demonstration in a relevant environment, life testing, etc., as appropriate;
5. An estimate of the resources (staffing, cost, and schedule) required to complete the technology and/or advanced engineering development; and
6. A description of any approaches to fallbacks/alternatives that exist and are planned, a description of the cost, decision date(s) for fallbacks/alternatives, relevant development schedules, and performance liens they impose on the baseline design, and the decision milestones for their implementation.
7. If no new technologies or advanced engineering development is required, system TRL 6 or above at the time of CSR submission shall be clearly demonstrated.

The Program Library provides examples of TRL-6 assessments and demonstrations relevant to AOs.

F.5. Assembly, Integration, Test, and Verification.

Requirement CS-49. This section shall present an illustration of the time-phased flow of the Integration and Test (I&T) Plan. It shall include the key facilities, testbeds, and team members involved in the I&T Plan.

Requirement CS-50. This section shall describe the project's assembly, integration, test, and verification (AIT&V) approach. Flow diagrams, narrative text, and/or other relevant data may be used to convey this information. Elements of the approach that pose special challenges for the project (e.g., mission critical performance or functional requirements that can't be tested on the ground, special facilities that may be required for testing, large scale simulation tools that are required to be developed and how they will be validated, critical path items, etc.) shall be emphasized. Any tools used to facilitate multiple builds, such as special facilities, additional GSE, special AIT&V staffing approach, and/or automation tools, shall be included. The I&T description shall demonstrate the credibility of the overall I&T approach, as reflected by consistency between the described test plans and the schedule, cost, and other resources needed to carry them out. The testing and verification of the space system's fault management approach and implementation shall be discussed.

F.6. Schedule

Requirement CS-50A (supersedes AO Requirement 102) The Concept Study Report shall be consistent with delivery of the flight system to the launch vehicle integrator no later than 31 May 2029.

Requirement CS-51. This section shall provide project schedule foldout(s) covering all phases of the investigation. The schedule shall go to at least WBS level 3 for the spacecraft elements (subsystem level) and Level 4 for the instrument complement (one level below each individual instrument), except where greater detail is necessary to identify critical paths, as well as significant TRL or engineering development activities and events. Schedule foldout(s) will not be counted against the page limits. The schedule format shall indicate the month and year of each milestone, have a corresponding table of dates, and follow standard NASA WBS elements for task descriptions as prescribed in NPR 7120.5 and the *NASA WBS Handbook*. The schedule foldout(s) and accompanying narrative (included in the page count for this section) shall address proposed major milestones including, at a minimum, the following items:

1. Spacecraft development, integration and test, and major review dates;
2. Instrument development and major review dates, including instrument-to-spacecraft/host integration and test, with provisions for Auroral Imager I&T shown if applicable;
3. Major deliverables (*e.g.*, Interface Control Documents (ICDs), simulators, Engineering Models (EMs) or Engineering Test Units (ETUs), flight models, *etc.*);
4. Any early risk-reduction testing (*e.g.*, TRL-6 demonstration; use of prototypes; EMs or ETUs for multiple-unit build production planning; *etc.*);
5. Ground systems development and major review dates (*e.g.*, mission operations and data analysis development schedule);
6. Launch vehicle integration and delivery readiness;
7. Compliance with NEPA and Nuclear Flight Safety processes, if appropriate;
8. Long-lead item development paths, and their impacts to schedule;
9. Development schedule for Student Collaborations (SCs) and/or Science Enhancement Options (SEOs), if any;
10. Schedule critical path identification, including any significant secondary critical paths; and
11. Funded schedule reserve, with indications of appropriate reserves associated with major milestones and deliverables, including allocated critical path reserves.

Requirement CS-52. The project schedule shall be additionally provided in a Microsoft Project format as part of the augmented submission. Although the project schedule foldout(s) in Requirement CS-51 does not need to have been generated in Microsoft Project, the project schedule provided in the electronic submission shall address the items specified in Requirement CS-51 at a level of detail commensurate with that of the graphical foldout. The Microsoft Project schedule shall be a fully Integrated Master Schedule for the project that provides quantified data set that will facilitate understanding of the proposed flow of development activities, timelines, milestones, schedule reserves, and risk. The level of linkage detail must be complete enough to substantiate the assignment of the primary critical path and any significant secondary critical path(s) in the graphical foldout(s). Task links are also needed to identify points of assembly, integration, and testing in the schedule and links to major milestones. A Phase B schedule consistent with the plans detailed in Section H shall be included in the file.

G. MANAGEMENT

Requirement CS-53. This section shall present the investigation's proposed management approach. The management organization chart shall be provided and the decision-making authority, and the teaming arrangement and responsibilities shall be discussed. The organization chart shall clearly indicate how the project team is structured. The internal operations and lines of authority with delegations, together with internal interfaces shall be described. Relationships with NASA, major subcontractors, and associated investigators shall be discussed. The primary team members reporting relationship within the project shall be provided. The mission unique roles and responsibilities, as specifically applicable to the proposed investigation, of the PI, Project Manager (PM), Project Systems Engineer (PSE), and other Key Management Team members shall be described. The commitments and the roles and responsibilities of all institutional team members, including team members responsible for SC (as applicable) shall be described.

Requirement CS-54. This section shall demonstrate how the proposed management plans, decision-making processes, tools (including performance measurement and reporting), and organization will be applied to manage and control the project during development and operation. The decision-making processes that the team will use shall be described, focusing particularly on the roles of the PI, Deputy Principal Investigator (DPI) if any, PM, PSE, and the balance of the Key Management Team in those processes. In particular, the management processes as they apply to the relationships among organizations and key personnel shall be described, including systems engineering and integration; requirements development; configuration management; schedule management; team member coordination and communication; progress reporting (both internal and to NASA); performance measurement; and resource management. This discussion shall include all phases of the mission, including preliminary analysis, technical definition, design and development, and operations phases, as well as products and results expected from each phase. The section shall include a clear description of the methods and frequency of planned communication within the project team. If applicable, the section shall describe how the team will be organized for the manufacture, test, and calibration of multiple flight units. If applicable, the section shall describe responsibilities for interfacing with the Auroral Imager team.

Requirement CS-55. This section shall summarize the relevant institutional experience and refer to supporting detail included in Appendix L.2, *Relevant Experience and Past Performance*. If experience for a partner organization is not equivalent to, or better than, the requirements for the proposed mission, explain how confidence can be gained that the mission can be accomplished within cost and schedule constraints.

Requirement CS-56. This section shall describe each key position, including its roles and responsibilities, how each key position fits into the organization, and the basic qualifications required for each key position. A discussion of the unique or proprietary capabilities that each partner organization brings to the team, along with a description of the availability of personnel at each partner organization to meet staffing needs, shall be included. The contractual and financial relationships between team partners shall be described. Where multiple builds are proposed, this section shall address the relevant experience as well as the staffing, facilities and

GSE capabilities of the implementing institutions commensurate with the needs of the multiple-build production.

Requirement CS-57. This section shall name all the team members who will occupy the key project management positions identified in Requirement CS-54. It shall, in addition:

1. Describe the previous work experience of each of these key individuals, including the outcomes and complexity of the work they did, and it shall explain the relevance of these experiences to the responsibilities of the key project management positions they will occupy;
2. Provide any program/project management certifications held by or planned to be obtained by the PM;
3. Address the role(s), responsibilities, commitments by phase, and percentage of time devoted to the mission for the PI, PM, PSE, and all other named key management individuals, and
4. Provide reference points of contact, including address and phone number, for each of these individuals.

Requirement CS-58. This section shall describe plans for risk management, both in the overall mission design and in the individual systems and subsystems. NASA's required risk management procedures are provided in NPR 8000.4, *Agency Risk Management Procedural Requirements*, available in the Program Library. SPD-39, *SMD Standard Mission Assurance Requirements for Payload Classification D* will also apply. Note a draft Mission Assurance Implementation Plan (MAIP) and Compliance Matrix must be submitted with the CSR (see Section L.24 of this document). This section shall describe plans for using standard risk management tools, including probability and impact charts, risk lists, mitigation plans and triggers. The role(s) in the risk management process of each of the key management personnel shall be discussed.

Requirement CS-59. This section shall describe the project risks and project resiliency considering these risks and shall include the items below in the form of a table.

1. The top risks considered significant by the project team, especially technical risks and risks associated with:
 - a. technology or advanced engineering developments discussed in Section F.4;
 - b. contributed hardware (if any);
 - c. international contributions (if any);
 - d. multiple-unit build production (if applicable), *etc.*
2. Potential mitigation strategies and associated cost and schedule impacts.
3. Quantitative risk assessments, where the probability and impact of occurrence are independently and numerically specified prior to mitigation; specification of probability and impact after mitigation is encouraged but not required.
 - a. Where appropriate, an impact may be specified in terms of any resource that is quantified in the CSR. Furthermore, individual quantitative risk assessments may address multiple resources, as well as temporal increments (*e.g.*, mitigation followed by post-mitigation).

- b. In order to determine the cumulative effect of risks on resources, each impact shall be paired with a probability.
 - c. The cumulative effect of the products of probabilities and impacts shall not reduce the resource below that necessary to achieve baseline science.
4. In the case of cost, the products of pre-mitigation probabilities and impacts shall be included as encumbered cost reserves or explicitly identified in the basis of estimate, including cost validations. If cost risks are in this list, they shall be discussed in Section I (see Requirement CS-83) of the CSR.

Requirement CS-60. This section shall describe any potential descoping of mission capabilities included in the proposed risk management approach. This discussion should consider the investigation as a total system, including instrument(s), spacecraft, ground system, access to space services, and operations. The description shall include the following:

1. a discussion of the approach to such descopes, including savings of resources (mass, power, dollars, schedule, etc.) by implementing descopes,
2. the decision milestone(s) for implementing descopes, and
3. the scientific impact of individual, as well as combined, descopes.

Requirement CS-61. If the CSR contains proposed contributions or cooperative arrangements, this section shall describe the technical and management interfaces in any proposed cooperative arrangements, explicitly demonstrating that the contributions are within the contributors' scientific and technical capabilities, and contingency plans for coping with potential failures of the proposed cooperative arrangements.

Requirement CS-62. This section shall include a discussion of the management approaches for controlling growth in the project cost during development and operations. This discussion shall be focused on issues that the project could reasonably foresee and the response to which would be within the project's control

Requirement CS-63. This section shall provide a summary of reserves in cost and schedule by mission phase, project element, and year, and shall discuss the rationale for each. The discussion shall include the following.

1. The specific means by which integrated costs, schedule, and technical performance will be tracked and managed;
2. Specific cost and schedule reserves and the timing of their application;
3. Management of the cost and schedule reserves, including who in the management organization manages the reserves and when and how the reserves are released, including the strategy for maintaining reserves as a function of cost-to-completion;
4. Identification of all funded schedule reserves; and
5. The relationship between the use of cost reserves and funded schedule reserves, potential descope options, and their effect on cost, schedule, and performance. When considering potential descope options, consider the investigation as a total system including instrument(s), spacecraft, ground system, launch services, and operations.

Requirement CS-64. This section shall clearly delineate the Government-furnished property, services, facilities, *etc.* required to accomplish all phases of the project.

Requirement CS-65. This section shall list the major project reviews expected to be conducted during the project's life cycle consistent with NPR 7120.5 and the approximate time frame in the Project Schedule for each review.

Tailoring to NASA requirements described in NPR 7120.5 may be proposed by missions at any risk classification. Proposers must identify any tailorable requirements that are proposed to be adjusted, provide a rationale for each adjustment, and describe the cost, schedule, and/or other benefits that would be realized should one or more of the adjustments be accepted by NASA. NASA's Science Mission Directorate has defined a new approach to managing Class-D science investigations. The *NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) Class-D Tailoring/Streamlining Decision Memorandum* describes the approach that has been approved by SMD leadership to guide the implementation of Class-D investigations. This Memorandum, along with other Class-D policy and guideline documents, are provided in the Program Library. All Class-D investigations solicited by these AOs must use the principles, guidelines, and approaches described in the documents. Investigations in other risk classes may also propose tailoring to NASA requirements. These adjustments reflect potential modifications to the baseline investigation, to be addressed after down-selection.

Requirement CS-66. This section shall describe any deviations from the prescribed requirements in NPR 7120.5, NPR 7123.1, or other NASA procedural requirements that will require a waiver during formulation.

Requirement CS-67. This section shall identify any adjustment to tailorable NASA requirements for consideration by NASA after down-selection, include the rationale for the adjustment, and describe the cost, schedule, and/or other benefits that would be realized should one or more of the adjustments be accepted by NASA. The CSR shall provide this information for proposed adjustments to requirements not specifically identified in the SPD-39 as already being tailored. Tailoring below the SPD-39 requirements is not allowed.

The panel evaluating the third evaluation criterion, *TMC Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation Implementation*, will provide comments to the Selection Official on the proposed tailoring of the requirements and their justifications. These comments will not be considered for the TMC Feasibility of the Proposed Investigation Implementation risk rating but may be considered in the selection decision.

Requirement CS-68. This section shall describe plans and capabilities for application of Earned Value Management (EVM) consistent with Section 4.6.2 of the AO.

Requirement CS-69. This section shall clearly describe the approach to reporting progress to the Government, and indicate the progress reviews the Government is invited to attend to provide independent oversight. The process, including the individual or organization responsible, for reporting integrated cost, schedule, and technical performance must be discussed. A description of the information to be presented shall be included.

Requirement CS-70. This section shall describe plans to retire risk due to uncertainty associated with contributions. It shall address:

1. Commitments for contributions from implementing organizations and/or other funding agencies. Letters of commitment from all organizations involved in a contribution, particularly including the implementing organization (*e.g.*, laboratory or institute) and, if external funding is required, the funding agency (*e.g.*, national space agency), shall be provided as an appendix (see Section L.1 of this document);
2. Mitigation plans, where possible, for the failure of funding and/or contributions to be provided when that funding and/or contributions are outside the control of the PI. Mitigation may include, but is certainly not limited to, descope the contributed items and holding reserves to develop the contribution directly. Note that reserves held for this purpose should be weighted by likelihood and are considered encumbered. When no mitigation is possible, this must be explicitly acknowledged, and the stability and reliability of proposed partners, as well as the appropriateness of any proposed contribution, should be addressed; and
3. Acknowledgement of the complexities and risks involved with contributions and plans to handle those complexities or risks. This includes the schedule risk for implementing any required technical assistance agreements and international agreements. An adequate and realistic schedule shall be allocated for having international agreements executed. NASA will not begin working on any international agreements until after the down-selection decision is made.

H. PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY COMPLETION (PHASE B) PLAN

Once entering Phase B, STP projects are subject to the same requirements as all other NASA projects. The CSR only satisfies some of the KDP-B deliverable requirements, and that the balance will have to be developed early in Phase B (consistent with Section 2.2.7.1 in NPR 7120.5: “In a two-step AO process, projects are down-selected following evaluation of concept study reports and the down-selection serves as KDP B. Following this selection, the process becomes conventional with the exception that products normally required at KDP B that require Mission Directorate input or approval will be finished as early in Phase B as feasible.”).

Requirement CS-71. This section shall address plans and products for the Preliminary Design and Technology Completion Phase (Phase B). It shall identify the key mission tradeoffs to be performed and options to be investigated during Phase B that could lead to reductions in risk of implementation, including those issues, technologies, and decisions points critical to mission success. This section shall also describe and provide the rationale for any anticipated long-lead acquisitions.

Requirement CS-72. The Phase B Plan shall include a detailed schedule and shall define the products to be delivered and the schedule for their delivery. The schedule shall include the PDR and delivery dates of the following required products:

- A detailed descope plan including the criteria, impact, and savings of descope options;
- A complete set of baseline Level 1 requirements, including mission success criteria; and
- The baseline project plan.

Requirement CS-73. If more than one contractual arrangement is needed for the completion of Phase B, a separate Statement of Work (SOW) and budget breakout shall be provided for each organization. Subsequent phases will be added to the contract after each phase has been approved through the confirmation review process.

I. COST AND COST ESTIMATING METHODOLOGY

The CSR cost proposal must provide information on the anticipated costs for all mission phases. A detailed cost proposal is required for Phase B (Requirement CS-91, Requirement CS-92, Section L.5). Cost estimates are also required for the follow-on phases (*i.e.*, Phases C/D, and E/F), including a description of the estimating techniques used to develop the cost (Requirement CS-93 through Requirement CS-95). See Section J for requirements for any SEO costs (Requirement CS-99). A discussion of the basis of estimate must be provided, with a discussion of heritage and commonality with other programs (Requirement CS-79 through Requirement CS-83), and an explanation of any cost savings that result from heritage. All costs, including all contributions made to the investigation, must be included (Requirement CS-89). Specific information that would better enable NASA to validate costs (*e.g.*, WBS Level 3 data) may be provided as an appendix (Section L.17) accompanied by files in the augmented submission. This can include cost by NASA fiscal year to the lowest level of detail the project is working with, in Microsoft Excel format.

Template for all cost tables referenced in this section are provided in the Program Library.

Requirement CS-74. This section shall provide a WBS as defined in NPR 7120.5 and the *NASA Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Handbook* and use it to describe how all project costs are accounted in the cost proposal. The structure of the WBS should be consistent with the plans set forth in the Science Implementation, Mission Implementation, and Management sections of the CSR and the SOW(s) provided as an appendix to the CSR. The WBS shall be described to the subsystem level (*e.g.*, Attitude Control System, Propulsion, Structure and Mechanisms) for the spacecraft, to at least the instrument level for simple instruments, and to the major component level for more complicated instruments. All other WBS elements shall be at least to the major task level (*e.g.*, Project Management, Systems Engineering, GSE).

Requirement CS-75. This section shall include the estimated cost of the proposed investigation. The estimated cost shall encompass all proposed activities, including all applicable mission phases, mission unique or special launch services (*e.g.*, load isolation systems, unique mechanical/electrical interfaces, payload processing facilities, commodities, post-encapsulation access requirements, supplemental propulsion systems, deployable telemetry tracking assets, and GN2 purge), flight systems, ground systems, establishment of an interface between the Flight Operations Team and the CARA team, ground network fees, contributions, any other AO-specific activities (*e.g.*, SC), and all cost reserves. Cost for ground network fees, data archive, and other mission-unique elements shall be clearly described. These costs shall be consistent with the policies and requirements in Sections 4 and 5 of the AO.

Requirement CS-76. This section shall show that the PIMMC has not increased over the Step-1 PIMMC by more than 20%.

Requirement CS-77. This section shall summarize the estimated costs to be incurred in Phases A through F, including: Concept and Technology Development (Phase A), Preliminary Design and Technology Completion (Phase B); Final Design and Fabrication (Phase C); System Assembly, Integration and Test, and Launch, extending through in-orbit checkout, usually launch plus 30 days (Phase D); Operations and Sustainment (Phase E); Closeout (Phase F); ground system costs beyond what is provided by the AO; access to space services beyond those provided by the AO; and cost of activities associated with social or educational benefits (if not incorporated in any of Phases A through F). The *Cost Table Template 1* shall be used to summarize these costs. The total mission cost estimate shall be consistent with the Work Breakdown Structure. Detailed plans for any aspects of the mission not discussed elsewhere in the CSR shall be discussed here. The funding profile shall be optimized for the mission. Contributions not included in the NASA SMD cost shall be clearly identified as separate line items.

Requirement CS-78. This section shall state the fraction of PIMMC incurred prior to KDP C (Confirmation) and justify inclusion of cost elements that are beyond the scope of the Formulation phase (see AO Section 4.1.1).

Requirement CS-79. This section shall provide a Basis of Estimate (BOE) that is clearly traceable to the WBS of Tables 3a and 3b, including a description of the methodologies and assumptions used to develop the proposed cost estimate. The cost estimating methodology discussion in this section shall provide an overview of the cost estimate development process. Additional cost estimates or other validation efforts shall be described, the results presented, and any significant discrepancies discussed. A description of cost reserves that provides insight into the adequacy and robustness of the proposed unencumbered cost reserves level(s) shall be provided. The rationale for the proposed cost reserve levels shall be presented. The section shall include additional quantified BOE data to assist the validation of the cost estimates. The following is a non-exhaustive list of examples of useful BOE data for different cost estimating methodologies.

- Example for system and subsystem estimates based on analogy. Include the original heritage cost and rationale for any adjustments used to obtain the current proposed element costs.
- Example for system and subsystem estimates based on a parametric model. Provide the name and version of the model, general heritage assumptions and other key inputs used that can help explain the cost estimate.
- Example for bottom-up system and subsystem estimates. Provide information on what portion of the WBS element is labor vs material. For the labor, provide a FTEs and/or WYEs breakout by year with average labor rates. For material provide a summary list of the significant hardware quotes used in the estimate, the date of the quote, and the importance of the quoted hardware to investigation success.

Requirement CS-80. If applicable, the BOE description shall document the multiple build costing methodology including the approach used to calculate recurring unit costs.

Requirement CS-81. If the proposed PIMMC is between \$120M and \$200M (FY23) and a reimbursement for contractor EVM difference is requested consistent with Section 4.6.2 of the

AO, then this section shall justify the project-specific estimate. The estimated difference, up to the \$1.5M (FY23) maximum reimbursement, shall be shown in the budget tables as part of the Enhanced PIMMC. If the estimated difference exceeds \$1.5M (FY23), include the remainder within the PIMMC.

Requirement CS-82. This section shall include a discussion of sources of estimate error and uncertainty in the proposed cost.

Requirement CS-83. This section shall include a discussion of cost risks and mitigation strategies.

Requirement CS-84. This section shall provide two foldout cost tables, using the template of *Cost Table Templates 3a and 3b*. The tables shall identify the proposed cost required in each project phase and in each Fiscal Year; the costs shall be respectively in Real Year dollars (RY) and in FY2023 dollars (FY23\$). The top portion of the tables shall contain cost data relevant to the PIMMC. The lower portions shall contain cost data for contributions and enhanced mission costs. The rows shall be the NASA standard WBS elements as defined in NPR 7120.5 and in the *NASA WBS Handbook*. The costs for most elements shall be provided at least to WBS Level 3. It is requested that instruments be shown to WBS Level 4 where the data is available. The costs of individual instruments and any unique flight system elements such as coordinating science ground stations, or nonstandard facilities, shall be explicitly shown. If multiple builds are proposed, the corresponding costs shall break out recurring and non-recurring portions at the system level (*e.g.*, instrument-level, spacecraft-level). The columns in the table shall be grouped and subtotaled by mission phase and shall be labeled with the appropriate Fiscal Years. Years that span more than one mission phase shall be split into two columns by mission phase. The tables include totals by WBS and by phase and life cycle in both RY\$ and Fiscal Year 2023 dollars (FY23\$). The Study Team shall use their own forward pricing rates to translate between RY\$ and FY23\$. For organizations that are without approved forward pricing rates, the Study Team may use the NASA inflation/deflation indices available in the Program Library to translate between RY\$ and FY23\$.

Requirement CS-85. The latest inflation index provided in the tables found in the Program Library shall be used to calculate all real-year dollar amounts if an industry forward pricing rate is not available. Note that the official inflation index table from Step 1 may have been updated. If something other than the provided inflation index is used, the rates used shall be documented.

Requirement CS-86. All costs shall include all burdens and profit/fee in real-year dollars by fiscal year, assuming the inflation rates used by NASA in the Program Library, or specifically documented industry forward pricing rates.

Requirement CS-87. This section shall identify each reserve amount to the lowest level consistent with the proposed reserve management strategy. For example, if each subsystem manager will have spending authority over a reserve for the subsystem, each such amount shall be identified separately. If more convenient, the reserve details may be shown in a separate table, with totals reported using each of *Cost Table Templates 3a and 3b*.

Requirement CS-88. This section shall show costs (NASA SMD and contributed) associated with each Co-I and collaborator using *Cost Table Templates 4a and 4b* respectively, on one page each; all Co-Is and collaborators shall be identified in the applicable table.

Requirement CS-89. This section shall fully cost and account for all contributions and direct/indirect costs associated with the work performed at NASA Centers, and summarize these costs in one page using the template provided in *Cost Table Template 5*. NASA Center costs shall include Civil Servant services, as well as the cost for the use of Government facilities and equipment on a full-cost accounting basis. The purpose of this data is twofold: 1) to determine those costs that are included in the NASA SMD cost but are not funded out of the STP program, and 2) to determine Civil Servant contributions that are not included in the NASA SMD cost. Teams should work with their respective NASA Centers to develop estimates for these costs. Contributions by NASA Centers should be documented by a Letter of Commitment, provided as an appendix (see Section L.1).

Requirement CS-90. The augmented submission shall include a table with the funding required in RY\$ by fiscal year using the format of *Cost Table Template 6*. If the mission is selected for flight, SMD will use this information to prepare its budget request.

Requirement CS-91. For Phase B only, the augmented submission shall include a time-phased cost breakdown for each WBS element, using the template of *Cost Table Template 2*. The submission shall use only the line items shown in *Cost Table Template 2* that are relevant for Phase B.

Requirement CS-92. This section shall provide a detailed cost proposal for performing the Phase B portion of the project. The Phase B cost proposal shall correlate with the plans set forth in the concept study. This Phase B cost proposal shall include the following elements:

1. Contract Pricing Proposal. Complete cost and pricing data for Phase B shall be submitted after down-selection by the down-selected team (see Section L.5 and Part III).
2. Work Breakdown Structure. This section shall show how the WBS of Requirement CS-74 applies to Phase B.
3. Proposal Pricing Technique. This section shall describe the process and techniques used to develop the cost proposal for Phase B. For portions of the cost proposal developed with a grass-roots methodology, the bases from which the estimates were derived and details on how the estimates were extrapolated from the bases shall be provided. For portions of the cost proposal derived from vendor quotes/historical actuals/catalogue prices/*etc.*, sufficient information shall be provided in order to understand the fidelity of the values. For portions of the cost proposal derived from analogies, the value of and the methodology for extrapolating the analogy shall be described. For portions of the cost proposal derived parametrically, the cost-estimating model(s) and techniques used in the Phase B cost estimate shall be described. The heritage of the models and/or techniques applied to this estimate, including any differences between projects contained in the model's database and key attributes of the proposed project shall be described. The section shall include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase B cost and identify those that are critical to cost sensitivity. If any "discounts" were assumed in the cost estimates for business practice

initiatives or streamlined technical approaches, the section shall describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and how they will be managed by the project team.

4. Workforce Staffing Plan. This section shall provide a Phase B workforce staffing plan (including Civil Servants) that is consistent with the WBS. This plan shall include all team member organizations and must cover all management, technical (scientific and engineering), and support staff. The Phase B workforce staffing plan shall be phased by month. Time commitments for the PI, PM, PSE, Co-Is, and other key personnel must be clearly shown.
5. Phase B Time-Phased Cost Summary. This section shall provide a summary of the total Phase B costs consistent with the table created for Requirement CS-91 (*Cost Table Template 2*). The Phase B cost summary shall include all costs to NASA SMD by WBS, as well as all contributed costs. The Phase B cost summary shall be phased by month.
6. Elements of Cost Breakdown. This section shall provide cost or pricing data as defined in FAR 15.401 and supporting evidence stating the basis for the estimated costs by the WBS levels used in the table created for Requirement CS-91 (*Cost Table Template 2*). This information is in addition to that provided in Requirement CS-74 through Requirement CS-91 and shall include, but is not limited to, the following cost elements.
 - a. Direct Labor to include:
 - i. the basis of labor-hour estimates for each of the labor classifications;
 - ii. the number of productive workhours per month;
 - iii. a schedule of the direct labor rates used in the proposal, with a discussion of the basis for developing the proposed direct labor rates for the team member organizations involved; the forward-pricing method (including midpoint, escalation factors, anticipated impact of future union contracts, *etc.*); and elements included in the rates, such as overtime, shift differential, incentives, and allowances;
 - iv. if available, evidence of Government approval of direct labor rates for proposal purposes for each labor classification for the proposed performance period; and
 - v. if Civil Servant labor is to be used in support of the Phase B study, but is not to be charged directly to the investigation, this labor shall be considered as a contribution by a domestic partner, subject to the same restrictions as other contributions by domestic or foreign partners, and a discussion of the source of funding for the Civil Servant contributions shall be provided.
 - b. Direct Material, to include a summary of material and parts costs for each element of the WBS.
 - c. Subcontracts, to identify each effort (task, item, *etc.*, by WBS element) to be subcontracted, and list the selected or potential subcontractors, locations, amount budgeted/proposed, and types of contracts; to explain the adjustments, if any, and the indirect rates (or burdens) applied to the subcontractors' proposed or anticipated amounts; and to describe fully the cost analysis or price analysis and the negotiations conducted regarding the proposed subcontracts.
 - d. Other Direct Costs, to include:
 - i. a summary of travel and relocation costs, including the number of trips, their durations, and their purposes;

- ii. a summary of all unique computer related costs;
 - iii. specific task areas of problems that require consultant services, including the quoted daily rate, the estimated number of days, associated costs (*e.g.*, travel) if any, and a statement of whether the consultant has been compensated at the quoted rate for similar services performed with Government contracts; and
 - iv. any other direct costs included in the proposal for Phase B, provided in a manner similar to that described above.
- e. Indirect Costs, to include:
- i. all indirect expense rates for the team member organizations (in the context of the AO, indirect expense rates include labor overhead, material overhead, general and administrative [G&A] expenses, and any other cost proposed as an allocation to the proposed direct costs);
 - ii. a schedule of off-site burden rates, including a copy of the company policy regarding off-site *vs.* on-site effort, if applicable;
 - iii. evidence of Government approval of any/all projected indirect rates for the proposed period of performance, including the status of rate negotiations with the cognizant Government agency, and a comparative listing of approved bidding rates and negotiated actual rates for the past five fiscal years; and
 - iv. fee arrangements for the major team partners.

Requirement CS-93. This section shall provide a cost estimate for performing the Final Design and Fabrication/System Assembly, Integration and Test, and Launch (Phase C/D) portion of the mission. The Phase C/D cost estimates shall correlate with the plans set forth in the concept study. The Phase C/D cost estimate description shall include the following elements:

1. Work Breakdown Structure. This section shall show how the WBS of Requirement CS-74 applies to Phase C/D.
2. Cost Estimating Techniques. This section shall describe the process and techniques used to develop the Phase C/D cost estimate. For portions of the cost proposal developed with a grass-roots methodology, the bases from which the estimates were derived and details on how the estimates were extrapolated from the bases shall be provided. For portions of the cost proposal derived from vendor quotes/historical actuals/catalogue prices/*etc.*, sufficient information shall be provided in order to understand the fidelity of the values. For portions of the cost proposal derived from analogies, the value of and the methodology for extrapolating the analogy shall be described. For portions of the Phase C/D cost estimate derived parametrically, the section shall describe the cost-estimating model(s) and techniques. The heritage of the models and/or techniques applied to this estimate including any differences between projects contained in the model's database and key attributes of the proposed project shall be described. The section shall include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase C/D cost and identify those that are critical to the cost sensitivity. The section shall identify any "discounts" assumed in the cost estimates for business practice initiatives or streamlined technical approaches and the basis for these discounts. The section shall describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and how they will be managed by the project team.

3. Workforce Staffing Plan. A Phase C/D workforce-staffing plan (including Civil Servants) that is consistent with the WBS shall be provided. This workforce-staffing plan shall include all team member organizations and should cover all management, manufacturing, technical (scientific and engineering), and support staff. The Phase C/D workforce staffing plan shall be phased by fiscal year. Time commitments for the PI, PM, PSE, Co-Is, and other key personnel shall be clearly shown.
4. Phase C/D Time-Phased Cost Summary. A summary of the total Phase C/D costs consistent with *Cost Table Template 2* shall be provided. The Phase C/D cost summary shall include all costs to NASA SMD by WBS, as well as all contributed costs. The Phase C/D cost summary shall be phased by fiscal year. Phase C/D extends 30 days beyond launch, including tracking support and mission operations.

Requirement CS-94. This section shall provide a cost estimate for performing the Operations and Sustainment Phase (Phase E) of the mission. The Phase E cost estimates shall correlate with the plans set forth in the concept study. The Phase E cost estimate description shall include the following elements:

1. Work Breakdown Structure. This section shall show how the WBS of Requirement CS-74 applies to Phase E.
2. Cost Estimating Techniques. This section shall describe the process and techniques used to develop the Phase E cost estimate. For portions of the cost proposal developed with a grass-roots methodology, the bases from which the estimates were derived and details on how the estimates were extrapolated from the bases shall be provided. For portions of the cost proposal derived from vendor quotes/historical actuals/catalogue prices/*etc.*, sufficient information shall be provided in order to understand the fidelity of the values. For portions of the cost proposal derived from analogies, the value of and the methodology for extrapolating the analogy shall be described. For portions of the Phase E cost estimate derived parametrically, the section shall describe the cost-estimating model(s) and techniques. The heritage of the models and/or techniques applied to this estimate including any differences between projects contained in the model's database and key attributes of the proposed project shall be described. The section shall include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase E cost and identify those that are critical to the cost sensitivity. The section shall identify any "discounts" assumed in the cost estimates for business practice initiatives or streamlined technical approaches and the basis for these discounts. The section shall describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and how they will be managed by the project team.
3. Workforce Staffing Plan. A Phase E workforce-staffing plan (including Civil Servants) that is consistent with the WBS shall be provided. This workforce-staffing plan shall include all team member organizations and should cover all management, manufacturing, technical (scientific and engineering), and support staff. The Phase E workforce staffing plan shall be phased by fiscal year. Time commitments for the PI, PM, PSE, Co-Is, and other key personnel shall be clearly shown.
4. Phase E Time-Phased Cost Summary. A summary of the total Phase E costs consistent with *Cost Table Template 2* shall be provided. The Phase E cost summary shall include all costs

to NASA SMD by WBS, as well as all contributed costs. The Phase E cost summary shall be phased by fiscal year.

Requirement CS-95. This section shall provide a cost estimate for performing the Closeout Phase (Phase F) of the mission. The Phase F cost estimates shall correlate with the plans set forth in the concept study. In completing this section, the following guidelines will apply:

1. Work Breakdown Structure. This section shall show how the WBS of Requirement CS-74 applies to Phase F.
2. Cost Estimating Techniques. This section shall describe the process and techniques used to develop the Phase F cost estimate and provide a description of the cost estimating model(s) and techniques. The heritage of the models applied to this estimate including any differences between projects contained in the model's database and key attributes of the proposed project shall be discussed. The section shall include the assumptions used as the basis for the Phase F cost and identify those that are critical to the cost sensitivity in the investigation. The section shall identify any "discounts" assumed in the cost estimates for business practice initiatives or streamlined technical approaches and the basis for these discounts. The section shall describe how these have been incorporated in the cost estimate and will be managed by the project team.
3. Workforce Staffing Plan. A Phase F workforce-staffing plan (including Civil Servants) that is consistent with the WBS shall be provided. This workforce-staffing plan shall include all team member organizations and should cover all management, manufacturing, technical (scientific and engineering), and support staff. The Phase F workforce staffing plan shall be phased by fiscal year. Time commitments for the PI, PM, PSE, Co-Is, and other key personnel shall be clearly shown.
4. Phase F Time-Phased Cost Summary. A summary of the total Phase F costs consistent with *Cost Table Template 2* shall be provided. The Phase F cost summary shall include all costs to NASA SD by WBS, as well as all contributed costs. The Phase F cost summary shall be phased by fiscal year.

The Phases C/D, E and F time-phase cost summaries for Requirement CS-93, Requirement CS-94 and Requirement CS-95 above may be combined into a single table in *Cost Table Template 2* format.

Immediately following the continuation decision (*i.e.*, down-selection), the contractor will be requested to submit a formal cost proposal based upon the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15. The instruction and format for submission of this formal cost proposal are found in FAR Part 15.403-5 and Table 15.2. The definitive contract will include an option provision for Phases B, C/D, E, and F with a not-to-exceed amount for each phase.

Requirement CS-96. The cost elements proposed in the formal proposal for contract award shall be traceable to the cost proposal provided in the CSR. Any changes in cost from the CSR shall be described in detail.

Requirement CS-97. Completed versions of *Cost Table Templates 1, 2, 3a and 3b, 4a, 4b, 5, 6, 7* shall be provided as additional files along with the augmented submission. Microsoft Excel

format templates of tables are available for download in a consolidated workbook from the Program Library.

- Cost Table 1: Total mission cost funding profile by organization
- Cost Table 2: Time-phased cost breakdown by WBS and major cost category
- Cost Table 3a: Total mission cost profile by mission phase, fiscal year, and WBS in real year dollars
- Cost Table 3b: Total mission cost profile by mission phase, fiscal year, and WBS in fiscal year dollars
- Cost Table 4a: Co-I funding profile by mission phase in real year dollars
- Cost Table 4b: Co-I funding profile by mission phase in fiscal year dollars
- Cost Table 5: NASA civil service costs by fiscal year in real year dollars
- Cost Table 6: Optional SC Incentive and SEO costs by fiscal year in real year dollars
- Cost Table 7: Funding profile for any SEO activities by fiscal year in real year dollars

J. JUSTIFICATION AND COST PROPOSAL FOR ANY SCIENCE ENHANCEMENT OPTION(S)

SEO activities are discussed in AO Section 5.1.5. The selections from the Step-1 proposals were made primarily on the merit of the baseline proposed science; no prejudice or commitment to any attendant proposed SEO activity was made at selection. It is incumbent upon investigation teams, therefore, to fully discuss these project additions in the CSR.

Funding for SEO activities are outside the PIMMC and will therefore result in a separate decision by NASA as to whether to accept or reject these proposed expansions to the Baseline Science Investigation. Therefore, the CSR must provide sufficient clarity to allow contractual execution if NASA elects to fund any SEO activities.

All definitions, guidelines and constraints outlined in the AO and applicable to SEOs are still valid for the concept study. There are no page count limits for narrative descriptions, rationale, and data for these enhancements, but conciseness and brevity are encouraged.

Requirement CS-98. If SEO activities are proposed, this section shall provide sufficient data and justifications to enable analysis of the science value of the concept, as well as of its viability and of its cost.

Requirement CS-99. This section shall provide a cost estimate for performing any SEO activities. In completing the Cost section, the guidelines for Phases B through D apply. Complete a one-page summary of costs using the format shown using the format of *Cost Table Template 7*. Also, include the total amount in the SEO line item at the bottom of the table in Requirement CS-84 (*Cost Table Templates 3a, 3b*). Include a discussion of the estimating techniques used to develop the cost estimates.

K. OPTIONAL STUDENT COLLABORATION

Requirement CS-100. If a Student Collaboration is proposed, this section shall describe a detailed plan. This plan shall include:

1. A summary description of the planned SC;
2. A development schedule for the SC, including decision points for determining readiness for flight;
3. A demonstration of how the SC will be incorporated into the mission investigation on a non-impact basis;
4. A plan for recruiting student participants, including a description of recruitment and retention policies likely to reach individuals from groups under-represented in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM);
5. A plan for the mentoring and oversight of students to maximize the opportunity for teaching, learning, and success in contributing to the mission;
6. An appropriate plan for evaluation.

Requirement CS-101. If a SC is proposed, this section shall demonstrate that the proposed SC is clearly separable from the proposed Baseline and Threshold Science Investigations; will not increase the mission development risk; and will not impact the science investigation in the event that the SC is not funded, fails during flight operations, or encounters technical, schedule, or cost problems during development.

Requirement CS-102. If a SC is proposed, this section shall identify the funding set aside for the SC, and any contributions to the SC. This funding may be outside the PIMMC up to the Student Collaboration incentive. Any SC costs beyond the Student Collaboration incentive, unless contributed, shall be within the PIMMC.

L. CSR APPENDICES

The following additional information is required to be supplied with the CSR. This information is to be provided in the form of appendices to the CSR, and, as such, will not be counted within the specified page limit.

L.1. Letters of Commitment and Letters of Support

Requirement CS-103. This appendix shall provide letters of commitment signed by officials authorized to commit the resources of the respective institutions or organizations from:

1. all organizations offering contributions of goods and/or services (including Co-Is and collaborator services, both U.S. and non-U.S) on a no-exchange-of-funds basis, including all non-U.S. organizations providing hardware or software to the investigation; and
2. all major or critical participants in the mission regardless of source of funding.

See AO Section 5.8.1 for definition of major partners and for the required elements in an institutional letter of commitment. Critical participants are those participants (organizations and individuals) who are assigned tasks considered by the PI to be critical to the success of the

mission, including those who provide unique required services. All other participants are non-critical. Participants may be members of multiple headings, in which case, provide a letter of commitment for each applicable heading. A complete letter of commitment from a vendor will include the specifics of the quote.

Requirement CS-104. If the use of NASA-provided communication and/or navigation services is proposed, this appendix shall include an associated letter of commitment from the network provider.

Requirement CS-105. This appendix shall provide personal letters of commitment signed by the individual from every Proposal Team member as defined in Section 5.8.2 of the AO. Personal letters of commitment shall indicate the Proposal Team member's commitment to the proposed investigation and specifically to the role, responsibilities, and participating organization proposed for them.

An email sent from the individual Concept Study Team member to the PI stating the member's commitment will be sufficient to satisfy the signature requirement for personal letters of commitment.

Requirement CS-106. This appendix shall include letters of commitment from non-U.S. individuals and/or institutions that are team members or contributors to the investigation. These letters of commitment shall provide evidence that the non-U.S. institution and/or government will commit the appropriate technical, personnel, and funding resources to the proposed investigation if selected by NASA.

The required elements in a letter of commitment are: (i) a precise description of what is being contributed by the partner and what assumptions are being made about NASA's role; and (ii) the strongest possible statement of whether the contribution will be funded, or what further decisions must be made before the funding is committed by the partner. An authorized officer or representative of the partner institution or government must sign the respective letter of commitment.

Letters of commitment provided for the Step-1 proposal can be reused if the description of the commitment is unchanged and if the letter of commitment meets the requirements for letters of commitment for the Concept Study Report.

Requirement CS-107. If the CSR includes any Letters of Support, the Letters of Support shall be included in this appendix. Expectations relating to Letters of Supports can be found in the AO Section 5.8.3.

L.2. Relevant Experience and Past Performance

In evaluating the CSR, NASA will consider the past performance of the major partner organizations. The evaluation of past performance will not be arithmetic; instead, the information deemed to be most relevant and significant will receive the greatest consideration. Relevant experience will be viewed as the demonstrated accomplishment of work, which is comparable or

related to the objectives of the proposed investigation and/or the scope of the proposed project. This includes space-based instrument development and investigations and associated development processes including engineering processes, management processes, operations, data analysis and delivery of data to the Solar Data Analysis Center, Space Physics Data Facility, or other appropriate data archives. NASA will review the past performance information provided by the proposer. In addition, NASA may review the major team partners' past performance on other NASA and/or non-NASA projects or contracts that provide insight into those institutions' past performance on airborne or space-based instrument or spacecraft development and investigations and associated development processes including engineering processes, management process, operations, data analysis and delivery of data to the appropriate data archive. In conducting the evaluation, NASA reserves the right to use all information available.

Requirement CS-108. This appendix shall describe relevant experience and past performance by the major team partners (organizations) in meeting the requirements of projects similar to the subject of the CSR. This may include space-based instrument development and investigations. The discussion of relevant experience and past performance shall include:

1. a description of each project;
2. its relevance to the subject of the CSR;
3. the proposed performance and the actual performance;
4. the planned delivery schedule of data to the appropriate data archive and the actual delivery schedule of data to the appropriate data archive;
5. the proposed cost and actual cost;
6. the proposed schedule and actual schedule;
7. an explanation of any differences between proposed performance, cost, and schedule and what was actually achieved; and
8. points of contact for the past project's customer. If the customer for the past project was the United States Government, then the contract number shall be included along with current technical point(s) of contact and phone number(s).

For projects that are not yet complete, the current projected performance, cost, and schedule shall be used in place of actual values. Projects that ended more than 5 years ago need not be included.

Investigation teams are cautioned that omissions or an inaccurate or inadequate response to this evaluation item will have a negative effect on the overall evaluation, and while NASA may consider data from other sources, the burden of providing relevant references that NASA can readily contact rests with the investigation team.

L.3. Resumes

Requirement CS-109. This section shall include resumes or curricula vitae for the PI, DPI (if one), PM, PSE, any other named Key Management Team members identified in the Management section, and all Co-Is identified in the Science section. Specifically, each resume shall cite the individual's experience that is pertinent to the role and responsibilities that they will assume in the proposed investigation. Project management experience shall be included in the resumes of the PI, PM, and PSE. Resumes or curriculum vitae shall be no longer than three pages for the PI

and one page for each additional participant. Resumes shall be organized alphabetically after that of the PI, by surname. Photographs shall not be included in any of the resumes.

L.4. Inclusion Plan

Requirement CS-110. In support of NASA's core value of Inclusion, this Appendix shall include a plan describing how the project would create and maintain an inclusive team. The plan shall:

1. Present goals for a positive and inclusive working environment, including but not limited to:
 - a. Identifying barriers to creating a positive and inclusive working environment that are specific to the team carrying out the proposed investigation;
2. Present objectives that, when achieved, would support a positive and inclusive working environment and represent significant progress towards the Plan goals, including but not limited to:
 - a. Addressing ways in which the investigation team would work to attenuate or reduce these barriers, such as fostering communication and openness amongst the team, accounting for power dynamics to support the team (*e.g.*, awareness of positionality affecting the behaviors team members), elevating voices, *etc.*, to create and sustain an inclusive environment;
3. Present investigation team activities that support a positive and inclusive working environment and the achievement of the Plan objectives, including but not limited to:
 - a. Describing actions that the team would take to complete the Plan objectives,
 - b. Describing any training that the team would participate in (*e.g.*, bystander intervention training, micro-aggression awareness training, *etc.*) to equip and train team members in such a way that they can go on to lead and contribute to other teams that are inclusive,
 - c. Describing any formal mentoring or professional development activities to be offered, and
 - d. Describing any agreements among the team members to be developed such as an Agreement on Acceptable Behavior; and
4. Present methods to ensure and document progress on the Plan, including but not limited to:
 - a. Describing quantitative and/or qualitative approaches for assessing the success of these activities including but not limited to metrics and milestones, any planned surveys, and formal evaluations, and
 - b. Describing annual and more-frequent reporting to NASA.

Requirement CS-111. This appendix shall provide a description of activities included in the Inclusion Plan that have been accomplished during Phase A.

It is expected that CSR' Inclusion Plans will be tailored specifically to issues that the investigation team would expect to encounter during the proposed work, rather than to generic

issues surrounding inclusion. Proposed Plans are not intended to address barriers in the broader STEM community that are not expected to be encountered by the investigation.

Proposers are encouraged to leverage institutional resources when available. Where a project draws upon a participating organization's inclusion policies and/or strategy, the Plan shall tailor that overarching strategy to the project and provide project-specific details for the other required elements.

The review of the merit of the Inclusion Plan will be led by individuals with practical and/or research experience in Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Accessibility (IDEA) topics and the application of IDEA principles to teams.

L.5. Phase B Contract Implementation Data

Provision of draft SOWs may be deferred to the date of each Concept Study Team's Site Visit.

Requirement CS-112. (deferred until after down-selection, see Part III) This appendix shall provide cost and pricing data for Phase B that meet the requirements of the FAR Part 15 Table 15-2. These cost and pricing data are necessary and required to implement the contract. Complete cost or pricing data shall be included with the CSR for each organization participating in Phase B, and must be signed by each organization's authorized representative. This requirement may be satisfied with one form, provided that all institutions involved in Phase B are included and have provided the appropriate signatures. These data are in addition to the data provided in *Cost Tables Templates 1-7* for evaluation purposes, and allocate project costs per the cost categories defined in Table 15-2, but still align at the highest levels with the evaluation data. Also see Section I of PART II above for additional guidance.

Requirement CS-113. This appendix shall provide draft SOWs for all potential contracts with NASA. SOWs shall be provided for each contract phase (*i.e.*, Phases B through F) and shall clearly define all proposed deliverables (including science data) for each option, potential requirements for Government facilities and/or Government services, and a proposed schedule for the entire mission.

L.6. Data Management Plan and Software Management Plan

Requirement CS-114. This appendix shall include a schedule-based end-to-end draft of the Data Management Plan (DMP). The plan shall be in compliance with the requirements and the guidelines in the *NASA Plan for Increasing Access to the Results of Scientific Research*, with the applicable version of SPD-41 and with the *Heliophysics Division Science Data Management Policy*, or a justification shall be provided that this is not necessary given the nature of the work proposed. The draft plan shall:

1. Include approaches for data retrieval, validation, preliminary analysis, image processing, calibration, correction, and archiving;
2. Identify science products (*e.g.*, flight data, ancillary or calibration data, theoretical calculations, higher order analytical or data products, laboratory data, *etc.*), including a list

of the specific data products, and the individual team members responsible for the data products;

3. Identify the calibration and measurement algorithm document, including a list of the individual team members responsible for the document;
4. Identify the appropriate NASA data archive and the formats and standards to be used. If a NASA archive is not identified, discuss how the mission will satisfy NASA's obligation to preserve data for future researchers;
5. Include an estimate of the raw data volume and a schedule – including the data latency by product – for the submission of raw and reduced data to the data archive, in physical units accessible to the science community, as well as required calibration information;
6. Demonstrate allocation of sufficient resources (cost, schedule, workforce, computational) for archiving as well as for preliminary analysis of the data by the Project Investigation Science Team, publication of the results in refereed scientific journals, as well as for the development of any new algorithms, software, or other tools.

Requirement CS-115. This appendix shall include a draft of the Software Management Plan (SMP). The SMP shall describe the software and tools to be developed (including their current status), the software and tool documentation, the planned license for the software, the open version control platform planned for use, the management for testing and management, and the individual team members responsible for the software and tools.

Requirement CS-116. If the investigation requires NASA High-End Computing (HEC) resources, this section shall state:

1. requirements, by year, for computing in the “standard billing units” (SBUs);
2. data storage need in Terabytes, by year;
3. explanation of the need to use this capability.

The Study Team does not need to submit a letter of support for use of NASA HEC resources. The general HEC webpage is at <https://hec.gsfc.nasa.gov/index.html>, and SBU Conversion Factors may be found at <https://www.hec.nasa.gov/user/policies/sbus.html>. Costs associated with HEC utilization will not count against the PIMMC.

L.7. Citizen Science Plan

CSRs that include Citizen Science (CS) must provide a Citizen Science Plan. This plan addresses the preparation, implementation, and management that are specific to CS. It only includes the aspects of the CS that facilitate the contribution of citizen scientists.

This plan does not include details of planned scientific analyses or the incorporation of those analytic results into project-led activities. All details necessary for demonstration of the scientific merit and scientific implementation merit must be included in Sections D-E for CS that is part of the Baseline Investigation, in Section E.7 for CS that is part of an SEO, and/or in Section K for CS that is part of a SC (see Sections 5.1.6 and 5.4.4 of the AO).

Projects that include a CS must provide a positive, meaningful CS participant experience that includes but is not limited to:

- training for and communication with the participants about
 - the scope and anticipated outcome,
 - the scope and importance of their contribution, and
 - presentations and publications that benefited from citizen scientists' contributions;
- good website design demonstrated by User Interface/User Experience requirements and assessments; and
- effective two-way communication and feedback.

The Citizen Science Plan consists of two parts: an Engagement and Utilization Plan and a Sunset Plan.

The Engagement and Utilization Plan describes the engagement of existing enthusiast communities and the utilization of existing platforms to maximize impact. CSRs are permitted to include the development of new platforms and communities, but must include a backup plan in case those development are not approved by SMD.

Requirement CS-117. If the CSR includes Citizen Science, this appendix shall include a Citizen Science engagement and utilization plan. This plan shall describe the interaction between the citizen scientists and the project, and shall address aspects that include but are not limited to:

1. definition of and process(es) to ensure a meaningful, positive participant experience;
2. engagement and utilization of enthusiast communities and platforms that the activity would engage and utilize;
3. development of new platforms and/or communities, including
 - a. sufficient discussion to demonstrate the necessity or benefit of their development,
 - b. the capability for the investigation to develop them, and
 - c. a backup to existing platforms and/or communities if new developments are not approved, including discussion of project degradation;
4. beta testing with citizen scientists before full public access and engagement;
5. process(es) to ensure broad participation appropriate to the nature of the project, including the collection and analysis of user data (and other data, as appropriate); and
6. a link to NASA's citizen science website (science.nasa.gov/citizenscience) on any citizen science project website.

The Sunset Plan describes completion and termination of project's CS. As part of the completion, all contributing citizen scientist volunteers must be informed of the project's results and be provided opportunities to be retained as part of the larger NASA citizen science community. The activity's websites that become inactive must inform visitors that they are no longer being updated, link to the project's results and publications, and link to at least one other relevant NASA citizen science project.

Requirement CS-118. If the CSR includes Citizen Science, this appendix shall include a Citizen Science sunset plan. This plan shall address both communications with all contributing citizen science volunteers and final modifications to and permanent archiving of activity websites.

The CS-specific requirements in this section apply separately to each occurrence of CS within a CSR, although a CSR may argue that the requirements are met for multiple occurrences by a single plan or other discussion.

L.8. Incentive Plan(s)

Requirement CS-119. If applicable, this appendix shall provide draft incentive plans. Incentive plans must outline contractual incentive features for all major team members. Incentive plans may include both performance and cost incentives, as appropriate.

L.9. Technical Content of any International Agreement(s)

Requirement CS-120. Draft language for the technical content of any International Agreement(s) is required for all non-U.S. partners in the investigation. Sample agreements are available in the Program Library. The draft language must include:

1. a brief summary of the mission and the foreign partner's role in it;
2. a list of NASA's responsibilities within the partnership; and
3. a list of the non-U.S. partner's responsibilities within the partnership. Note that NASA prefers to establish agreements with foreign Government funding agencies, and not with the institution that will be funded to perform the work.

L.10. International Participation Plans (Update from Proposal)

Requirement CS-121. If the investigation includes international participation, either through involvement of non-U.S. nationals and/or involvement of non-U.S. entities, this section shall describe plans for compliance with U.S. export laws and regulations; *e.g.*, 22 CFR 120 130, *et seq.* and 15 CFR 730-774, *et seq.*, provided in the Step-1 proposal (see Appendix B, Section J.5 in the AO). The discussion shall describe in detail the proposed international participation and shall include, but not be limited to, whether or not the international participation may require the proposer to obtain the prior approval of the Department of State or the Department of Commerce via a technical assistance agreement or an export license or whether a license exemption/exception may apply. If prior approvals via licenses are necessary, the CSR shall include a discussion of whether the license has been applied for or, if not, the projected timing of the application and any implications for the schedule.

Requirement CS-122. If a CSR includes international participation, this appendix shall include the following statement, "If selected for flight, U.S. export laws and regulations; *e.g.*, 22 CFR 120 130, *et seq.* and 15 CFR 730 774, *et seq.*, as applicable to the scenario surrounding the particular international participation, will be followed."

L.11. Requirements Related to Orbital Debris, Collision Avoidance and End-of-Mission

Per NPR 8715.6, *NASA Procedural Requirements for Limiting Orbital Debris and Evaluating the Meteoroid and Orbital Debris Environments*, orbital debris is defined as any object placed in space by humans that remains in orbit, and no longer serves any useful function. Objects range from spacecraft to spent launch vehicle stages to components, and also include materials, fragments, or other objects which are intentionally or inadvertently cast off or generated.

Every selected investigation team must conduct a formal assessment during Phase A of the orbital debris the spacecraft(s) or instrument(s) will create upon mission termination.

Requirement CS-123. This appendix shall discuss briefly how the mission meets the NPR 8715.6 and NASA-STD-8719.14 orbit debris requirements applicable to its proposed orbit. For LEO missions, this appendix shall briefly discuss the lifetime of the mission and whether it meets the 25-year post-mission requirement. An orbital lifetime analysis addressing all assumptions and inputs contributing to the analysis shall be provided and describe, at a minimum:

- Vehicle mass,
- Drag area or cross-sectional area,
- Initial orbit used for the analysis,
- Solar and atmospheric conditions assumptions (i.e., models or parameters),
- Methodology: analytical tool, table lookup, reference plot, and
- Develop an Initial Orbital Debris Assessment Report (ODAR) and assess whether an End-of-Mission Plan (EOMP) is required.

NASA-STD 8719.14 indicates “an ‘Initial ODAR’ is required for each project to assist NASA management in considering potential orbital debris issues during concept development (Phase A) and development of preliminary requirements, specifications, and designs (Phase B) to estimate and minimize potential cost impacts.” As such, an Initial ODAR may be submitted in response to this section. However, given that the Office of Safety and Mission Assurance (OSMA) will not interface with projects until Phase B, the Step-2 Evaluation Panel will perform the reviews referenced in NASA-STD 8719.14. While Initial ODAR Section 2 (Orbital Debris Limitation Summary) indicates that “Further analyses are not needed at this time”, questions that require analysis or raise concerns regarding the design of the mission (e.g., objects significantly greater than the 1 kg threshold in question (i) for Full Spacecraft Development, or constellations of spacecraft), may elicit follow-ups from the Step-2 Evaluation Panel.

Requirement CS-124. This appendix shall provide a brief description, including any cost deltas, of the impact on the investigation if the 25-year post-mission orbital lifetime requirement is changed to 5 years. This description shall assume that the requirement change is implemented at PDR. The evaluators may submit comments to the Selection Official on appendix material that addresses this requirement.

Requirement CS-125. If the plan is to dispose of the satellite at the end of mission, this appendix shall provide the parameters of the disposal orbit, the delta-v allocation for disposal, and any other relevant assumptions.

NASA has established conjunction assessment risk analysis requirements in NASA Interim Directive (NID) 7120.132 for Earth-orbiting missions up through GEO and NPR 8715.6, Chapter 3 for missions in other orbits, which will apply to investigations selected through this AO. NASA Interim Directive (NID) 7120.132 has been superseded by NPR 8079.1 but NID 7120.132 is still in effect for this CSR evaluation. For Earth-orbiting missions, the Conjunction Assessment Risk Analysis (CARA) team at the NASA GSFC is funded directly by NASA Headquarters (HQ) to perform the actual analysis and risk assessment; the costs for these services need not be included in the PIMMC. However, an investigation to which these requirements are applicable will have to budget costs under the PIMMC to establish a working interface between the Flight Operations Team and the CARA team in the Concept Study Report. (See AO Section 4.6.4)

Requirement CS-126. This section shall discuss briefly how the mission meets the NID 7120.132 conjunction assessment and collision avoidance requirements applicable to its proposed orbit. The discussion shall include, at a minimum:

- Schedule and plans for development of an Orbital Collision Avoidance Plan (OCAP) and Conjunction Assessment Operations Implementation Agreement (CAOIA),
- Plans and cadence for production of spacecraft ephemerides and their delivery to CARA,
- Plans and cadence for maneuver notifications to CARA and for pursuing close approach mitigations as needed.

The Program Library includes Office of the Chief Engineer (OCE)'s document OCE-51, *NASA Spacecraft Conjunction Assessment and Collision Avoidance Best Practices Handbook* for more information.

L. 12. Compliance with Procurement Regulations by NASA PI Proposals.

This appendix is required only for CSRs submitted by NASA PIs or NASA Centers (excluding JPL). CSRs submitted by NASA Centers must comply with regulations governing proposals submitted by NASA PIs (NFS 1872.306).

Requirement CS-127. For a NASA Center CSR, this appendix shall include any descriptions, justifications, representations, indications, statements, and/or explanations that are required by the regulations.

L. 13. Master Equipment List

Requirement CS-128. The augmented submission shall include a Master Equipment List (MEL) in a spreadsheet format summarizing all major components of each flight element subsystem and each instrument element component. Fully contributed instruments shall include enough subsystem detail to support validation of instrument design. However, the MEL shall not include the spacecraft detail when entirely contributed. A Microsoft Excel template of the MEL is available for download in the Program Library.

The MEL will support validation of proposed mass estimates, power estimates, contingencies, design heritage, and cost.

The breakouts should be traceable to block diagrams and heritage claims provided in other parts of the CSR. For each major component, current best estimates (CBE) and contingency for mass and power, number of flight units required, and some description of the heritage basis must be provided. Power values should represent nominal steady state operational power requirements. Information to be provided includes identification of planned spares, identification of engineering models and prototypes with their fidelities, required deliveries for simulators and testing, contingency allocations for individual components, and other component description/characteristics.

Certain items should include additional details sufficient to assess functionality and/or cost, to identify and separate individual elements. List each electronic board separately, identify the functionality of each board (either in the MEL or in the Mission Implementation section), and provide the board clock speed. If proposing Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs) or Application Specific Integrated Circuits (ASICs), or Radio Frequency Integrated Circuits (RFICs), list the design size (in the appropriate sizing parameter such as logic cells, logic elements), the board the chip(s) will be integrated onto, and how much heritage will be used in the design.

Requirement CS-129. This appendix shall include a PDF copy of the Microsoft Excel MEL.

L.14. Heritage

Requirement CS-130. This appendix shall discuss each element of any heritage from which the proposed investigation derives substantial benefit, including heritage from spacecraft subsystems, instruments, ground systems, flight and ground software, test set ups, simulations, analyses, *etc.* This discussion shall be at an appropriate level of granularity (*e.g.*, component, assembly, subsystem) to clearly separate the heritage element from other elements of the design. The discussion of each element shall include:

1. A concise description of the design heritage claimed;
2. A description of changes required to accommodate project-unique applications and needs;
3. Anticipated benefits to the proposed investigation;
4. A brief rationale supporting the claim that the benefits of heritage will be achieved; and
5. For any proposed elements with substantial design heritage, a comparison of the cost of the heritage items to the proposed cost.

The discussion shall substantiate all heritage claims, including descriptions of changes required to accommodate project-unique applications and needs. Where enhancements to heritage elements are proposed or heritage is from a different application, sufficient descriptions must be provided to independently assess the current level of maturity.

The evaluation team will use a scale with three levels (full, partial, or none) as illustrated in Table 6 (Section J.12) of the AO.

L.15. Classified Materials.

See Section 5.8.5 of the AO for options and associated requirements. The Step-1 page limit does not apply.

L.16. Small Business Subcontracting Plan

Requirement CS-131. This appendix shall provide a small business subcontracting plan covering Phases B through F, including the proposed goals and targets and the quality and level of work that will be performed by various categories of small business concerns, as described in Section 5.5.1 of the AO, with the exception of separately identifying and being evaluated on participation targets of Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) concerns in North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes determined by the Department of Commerce to be underrepresented industry sectors. Its effect on the technical, management, and cost feasibility of the investigation shall be described.

This plan will be negotiated prior to any Phase B contract award.

L.17. Additional Cost Data to Assist Validation (Optional)

In addition to the specific cost table data requested in the Cost Proposal (Section I), investigation teams may also provide any additional costing information/data that they feel will assist NASA to validate the project's proposed costs. Vendor quotes, cost estimates, rationale for design heritage cost savings, are all examples of data that can be included here. Input and output files for any publicly available cost model may be included with the augmented submission, if accompanied by discussion in this appendix.

The information provided may also include cost by NASA fiscal year to the lowest level of detail the project is working with, in Microsoft Excel format.

L.18. Science Change Matrix

Requirement CS-132. This appendix shall document all modifications made to the Science Investigation (Section D) since the original Step-1 submission in a table with the following columns:

1. the section/paragraph in the CSR where the modification occurs,
2. whether the modification represents a change to a science objective or related performance,
3. description of the change, and
4. rationale for the change.

Science Change Matrix Example, available in the Program Library, provides an example format for Appendix L.18 (under "Entries in Science Change Matrix"). This format documents Section D changes and provides rationale for those changes.

L.19. Impact to the Investigation if GDC Data are not Available

NASA formulated DYNAMIC with the expectation that it would leverage data from the GDC mission. This appendix discusses the impact to the proposed science investigation if GDC data are not available when DYNAMIC enters science operations.

This appendix is based on the following assumptions:

- No additional data would be made available for DYNAMIC's use.
- No spaceflight system design changes would be made.
- No modification or adjustment to the cost cap is allowed.
- The access to space requirement remains unchanged.
- All non-GDC-related requirements remain unchanged.

The evaluators may submit comments to the Selection Official on this appendix.

Requirement CS-133. This appendix shall quantify the impact to the Baseline Science Investigation if GDC data were to be not available during the DYNAMIC science operations. This quantification of the impact shall be based on discussion of GDC data in the research plan and/or inclusion in the Science Traceability Matrix.

L.20. Communications Design Data

Requirement CS-134. This appendix shall provide data and detailed link analyses for all communication modes, adequate to assess the design of the communications concept. This shall include:

1. A communications block diagram (showing all components);
2. A discussion of compliance with the applicable maximum channel bandwidth limits;
3. Link budget design control tables for all radio communications links (data and carrier) showing relevant spacecraft and earth station parameters and assumptions for the highest data rate and the emergency link at the maximum distance and throughput at which each particular link could be used. In particular the following parameters shall be provided:
 - a. Transmitter RF Output Power,
 - b. Transmitter Antenna Gain,
 - c. Transmitter Off-Boresight Pointing Loss,
 - d. Transmitter Circuit Loss,
 - e. Carrier Frequency,
 - f. Transmitter-Receiver Range,
 - g. Receiver Antenna Gain,
 - h. Receiver Off-Boresight Pointing Loss,
 - i. Receiver Circuit Loss,
 - j. Receiver Bandwidth,
 - k. Receiver System Temperature,
 - l. Hot Body Noise Temperature,
 - m. Data Modulation Index,

- n. Ranging Modulation Index (if used),
- o. Data Rates, including bit rate and symbol rate,
- p. Forward Error Correcting Code including code rate, block size (if applicable), constraint length (if applicable),
- q. Carrier Modulation Index,
- r. Carrier Link Margin, and
- s. Data Link Margin.

For more information on these requirements, including table format, see NASA's *Mission Operations and Communication Services*, available in the Program Library.

L.21. Project Protection Plan

The CSR must address the Project Protection Plan, including compliance with NASA-STD-1006 as discussed in Section 5.2.10 of the AO.

Requirement CS-135. This appendix shall provide the detailed plans addressing the protection of uplink commands using approaches compliant with FIPS 140 Level 1.

Requirement CS-136. This appendix shall provide the detailed plans addressing the ability of command uplink, position, navigation, and timing subsystems to recognize and survive interference.

Requirement CS-137. This appendix shall provide the detailed plans addressing the protection of command uplink information at no less than the CUI level.

Requirement CS-138. This appendix shall provide the detailed plans addressing the development of a Project Protection Plan (PPP) by PDR, including Candidate Protection Strategies (CPSs).

The Program Library includes a template *Project Protection Plan*.

Questions concerning the Project Protection Plan may be addressed to: Jerry Esper, SMD Program Executive for Systems Security, E-mail: jerry.s.esper@nasa.gov.

L.22. Cybersecurity

With the rise in cyberattacks on all computer systems, NASA needs to be proactive in protecting all flight and ground assets. To protect mission IT assets, NASA requires projects to develop a System Security Plan (SSP) using the NIST 800-53 controls as a basis. The requirement to follow NIST 800-53 flows from NPR 2810.1. The SSP begins with a description of the mission, including all end-to-end data flows, and uses NIST 800-series documents to develop the content of the SSP.

Requirement CS-139. This appendix shall provide a ground system data flow diagram showing end-to-end flows of all mission data, including any flows to facilities outside the control of the mission itself (such as ground stations).

Requirement CS-140. This appendix shall demonstrate that adequate resources (including, but not limited to, cost, schedule, technical accommodation, *etc.*) have been allocated to develop and implement a System Security Plan consistent with NIST 800-53.

Questions concerning Cyber Security may be addressed to: Jerry Esper, SMD Program Executive for Systems Security, E-mail: jerry.s.esper@nasa.gov.

L.23. Draft Mission Definition Requirements Agreement

Requirement CS-141. This appendix shall provide a draft Mission Definition Requirements Agreement (MDRA). MDRAs define Level 2 requirements for the baseline mission, encompassing the programmatic, science and instrument, mission implementation and spacecraft, and ground data requirements.

An example MDRA is provided in the Program Library.

L.24. Draft MAIP and MAR Compliance Matrix

Requirement CS-142. This section shall provide a draft Mission Assurance Implementation Plan (MAIP) and Compliance Matrix for the SPD-39: *SMD Standard Mission Assurance Requirements for Payload Classification D* document in the Program Library. See the document for details.

Requirement CS-143. The draft MAIP shall describe the approach to the selection of Electrical, Electronic, Electromechanical, and Electro-Optical (EEEE) parts, covering all major vendors and suppliers.

Appendix C of SPD-39 provides a template of the compliance matrix.

Requirement CS-144. For every item marked “Yes” in the draft Compliance Matrix to SPD-39, the comment column shall indicate how compliance will be achieved.

Requirement CS-145. For every item not marked “Yes” in the draft Compliance Matrix to SPD-39, the comment column shall explain the reason for the deviation from full compliance and the approach to meeting the intent of the requirement. The comment shall discuss any resulting risk to investigation success.

L.25. Rideshare Accommodation Worksheet

Requirement CS-146. The CSR shall demonstrate planning for compliance with the requirements and enveloping characteristics in the SIS. This appendix shall summarize the technical requirements that the investigation places on the vehicle using the Step-2 *Rideshare Accommodation* worksheet template provided in the Program Library. The table shall not include any new information but shall include references to sections in the CSR where each requirement is addressed. The CSR shall give details of significant deviations from any “should” statements

in the SIS. This table shall be provided as a spreadsheet in the augmented submission via the NASA Box service.

L.26. Storage Plan

Requirement CS-147. This section shall present a storage plan for the ramp-down, steady-state, and ramp-up to launch. CSRs shall plan a storage period covering twelve months of storage and a ramp-up to launch of no less than three months. The plan shall include the approach to maintaining the project team's readiness during the storage period. This shall include the retention of necessary expertise and/or succession training sufficient to ensure unretained expertise is replaced. The storage plan may include succession training that begins before the ramp-down period.

L.27. Flexibility to Launch Configuration

Requirement CS-148. This appendix shall discuss flexibility to reconfigure the proposed flight system for launch on a dedicated launch vehicle matching the descriptions in the *Launch Services Program Information Summary* (LSPIS) document, to include:

1. If applicable, a figure showing how the flight system would be re-configured inside the fairing shown in the LSPIS document. The figure shall include sufficient dimensions to validate fit within this fairing static envelope, including any close approaches.
2. If applicable, a description of payload adapter(s) that would be used in order to combine the elements from two ESPA Grande-type ports, into a single fairing.
3. A discussion of any other challenges and concerns associated with adapting the baseline rideshare design to a dedicated launch. This discussion can consider technical accommodation (interfaces, environments, assembly, launch processing, *etc.*) as well as project schedule.
4. An estimate of the changes to proposed cost that would be associated with this change. Note that any such cost would not be part of the PIMMC, nor should it be included in any of the CSR cost tables.

L.28. Justification for the use of non-AMMOS MOS/GDS Tools

Requirement CS-149. This section shall describe the justification for using Mission Operation System or Ground Data System (MOS/GDS) tools other than those available from the Advanced Multi-Mission Operating System (AMMOS). For each non-AMMOS tool, this section shall contain:

1. A list of requirements that the equivalent AMMOS tool does not meet for the proposed flight project; and
2. The proposed non-AMMOS tool that satisfies the listed requirements.

If an AMMOS tool will meet the flight project requirements, this section must outline the reasons for not using that tool (*e.g.*, cost of mission-specific adaptations to the AMMOS tool, extensive heritage of use of the non-AMMOS tool by the mission operator).

L.29. Impact of SIS Update (Optional)

In addition to general clarification of the DYNAMIC SIS for Step 2, SIS Appendix B – (*Encompassing Launch Vehicle Environments*) and Figure 6.2 have been updated to reflect the latest data available. While representing launch vehicle environments as accurately as possible is in NASA’s interest for implementation, the SIS environment updates may impact the mission design.

Requirement CS-150. This appendix shall quantify any impact on the mission design from the updated launch vehicle environments in the DYNAMIC SIS, Appendix B and Figure 6.2. This assessment shall be for the CSR mission design, compared to how the mission design would have been under the previous SIS.

L.30. Acronyms and Abbreviations List

Requirement CS-151. This appendix shall provide a list of abbreviations and acronyms.

L.31. References and Management Standards List

The CSR may additionally provide, in this appendix, a list of other reference documents and materials used in the concept study. The documents and materials themselves cannot be submitted unless they are within the CSR’s page limit. Investigation teams are encouraged to include an active URL for those documents available through the Internet. If the URL is password protected, provide the password in the CSR. This may not include references to audio or video materials. However, CSRs must be self-contained: any data or other information intended as part of a CSR must be included within the CSR itself.

In addition, if the CSR proposes to use internal program and project management standards, then this section must provide those standards.

Requirement CS-152. This section shall provide a list of any internal program and project management standards to be used in the proposed development (*e.g.*, GEVS, “GOLD Rules”). To the extent practicable, the referenced documents shall be included with the augmented submission.

Requirement CS-153. If one or more references includes ITAR/EAR material, it shall be made available to NASA in a properly marked form via the augmented submission process.

PART III – OTHER FACTORS REQUIRED AFTER DOWN-SELECTION

Phase B Contract Implementation Data

Immediately following the continuation decision (*i.e.*, down-selection), successful teams will be requested to submit a formal cost proposal based upon the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15. The instruction and format for submission of this formal cost proposal are found in FAR Part 15.403-5 and Table 15-2. Teams will be required to provide cost and pricing data for Phase B that are necessary and required to implement the contract for Phase B. Complete cost and pricing data will be required for each organization participating in Phase B. These data should allocate project costs per the cost categories defined in Table 15-2. See Section I of PART II for additional guidance.

PART IV – ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AA.....	Associate Administrator
AES.....	Advanced Encryption Standard
AIT&V.....	Assembly, Integration, Test and Verification
AMMOS.....	Advanced Multi-Mission Operations System
AM&O.....	Agency Management and Operations
AO.....	Announcement of Opportunity
AOR.....	Authorized Organizational Representative
APPEL.....	NASA Academy of Program, Project, and Systems Engineering Leadership
ASIC.....	Application-Specific Integrated Circuits
ASRC.....	Arctic Slope Regional Corporation
BIS.....	Bureau of Industry and Security
BOE.....	Basis of Estimate
BOL.....	Beginning of Life
BOM.....	Beginning of Mission
CADRe.....	Cost Analysis Data Requirement
CAOIA.....	Conjunction Assessment Operations Interface Agreement
CARA.....	Conjunction Assessment Risk Analysis
CBE.....	Current Best Estimate
CCR.....	Central Contractor Registry
CD-ROM.....	Compact Disc-Read Only Memory
CDR.....	Critical Design Review
CEQ.....	Council on Environmental Quality
CESO.....	Center Engineering, Safety, and Operations
CFR.....	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAD.....	Calibration Measurements and Algorithms Document
CM&O.....	Center Management and Operations
C&N.....	Communication and Navigation
Co-I.....	Co-Investigator
CPS.....	Candidate Protection Strategy
C&R.....	Criteria and Requirements
CS.....	Citizen Science
CSCI.....	Computer Software Configuration Item
CTS.....	Cornell Technical Services
DAAC.....	Distributed Active Archive Center
DLA.....	Declination of Launch Asymptote
DMP.....	Data Management Plan

DOD.....Department of Defense
DOE.....Department of Energy
DOR.....Differential One-way Ranging
DPI.....Deputy Principal Investigator
DRD.....Delivery Readiness Date
DSN.....Deep Space Network
DTN.....Delay/Disruption Tolerant Networking
DYNAMIC.....Dynamical Neutral Atmosphere-Ionosphere Coupling
EA.....Environmental Assessment
EAR.....Export Administration Regulations
EASSS.....Evaluations, Assessments, Studies, Services, and Support
EBPOC.....Electronic Business Point of Contact
EEEE.....Electrical, Electronic, Electromechanical, and Electro-Optical
EIRP.....Effective Isotropic Radiated Power
EIS.....Environmental Impact Statement
EM.....Engineering Model
EOL.....End of Life
EOM.....End of Mission
EOSDIS.....Earth Observing System Data and Information System
ETU.....Engineering Test Unit
EV.....Earth Venture
EVM.....Earned Value Management
ESA.....European Space Agency
FAQ.....Frequently Asked Questions
FAR.....Federal Acquisition Regulation
FASAB.....Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FFRDC.....Federally Funded Research and Development Center
FONSI.....Finding of No Significant Impact
FOV.....Field Of View
FPGA.....Field-Programmable Gate Array
FSR.....Funded Schedule Reserve
FTE.....Full Time Equivalent
FY.....Fiscal Year
G&A.....General and Administrative
GAO.....Government Accountability Office
GBO.....Ground-Based Observatory
GDC.....Geospace Dynamics Constellation
GDS.....Ground Data System
GEO.....Geosynchronous Orbit

GFE.....Government Furnished Equipment
 GFS.....Government Furnished Service
 GSE.....Ground Support Equipment
 GSFC.....Goddard Space Flight Center
 HBCU.....Historically Black Colleges and Universities
 HBZ.....HUB Business Zone
 HPD.....Heliophysics Programs Division
 HQ.....Headquarters
 HSPD.....Homeland Security Presidential Directive
 HUBZone.....Historically Underutilized Business Zone
 IAT.....Integration, Assembly, and Test
 ICD.....Interface Control Document
 IDEA.....Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Accessibility
 IRD.....Interface Requirements Document
 ISAS.....Institute of Space and Astronautical Science
 I&T.....Integration and Test
 ITAR.....International Traffic in Arms Regulations
 IV&V.....Independent Verification and Validation
 JPL.....Jet Propulsion Laboratory
 JSC.....Johnson Space Center
 KDP.....Key Decision Point
 LaRC.....Langley Research Center
 LEGS.....Lunar Exploration Ground System
 LRD.....Launch Readiness Date
 LSP.....Launch Service Provider
 LSPIS.....Launch Service Provider Information Summary
 LV.....Launch Vehicle
 MA.....Mission Assurance
 MADCAP.....Mars (and Moon) Deep-space Collision Avoidance Process
 MAIP.....Mission Assurance Implementation Plan
 MCO.....Mission Commitment Office
 MCR.....Mission Concept Review
 MDAA.....Mission Directorate Associated Administrator
 MDRA.....Mission Design Requirements Agreement
 MEL.....Master Equipment List
 MEV.....Maximum Expected Value
 MGSS.....Multi-mission Ground Systems and Services
 MMRTG.....Multiple Mission Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator
 MOC.....Mission Operations Center

MOCS	Mission Operations and Communications Services
MO&DA	Mission Operations and Data Analysis
MOS	Mission Operations Services
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPV	Maximum Possible Value
MRPP	Mission Resilience and Protection Program
MTM	Mission Traceability Matrix
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NASA-STD	NASA-Standard
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFS	NASA FAR Supplement
NFS	Nuclear Flight Safety
NID	NASA Interim Directive
NISN	NASA Integrated Services Network
NLS	NASA Launch Services
NODIS	NASA Online Directives Information System
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPD	NASA Policy Directive
NPR	NASA Procedural Requirements
NRA	NASA Research Announcement
NRC	National Research Council
NRESS	NASA Research and Education Support Services
NRP	NASA Routine Payload
NSF	National Science Foundation
NSN	Near Space Network
NSPIRES	NASA Solicitation and Proposal Integrated Review and Evaluation System
NSS	NASA Safety Standard
OCAP	Orbital Collision Avoidance Plan
OCE	Office of the Chief Engineer
OCFO	Office of the Chief Financial Officer
OCI	Organizational Conflict of Interest
ODAR	Orbital Debris Assessment Report
ODEO	Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity
OMI	Other Minority Institution
ORR	Operations Readiness Review
OSMA	Office of Safety and Mission Assurance
OSS	Office of Space Science
OSTP	Office of Science and Technology Policy

PDF	Portable Data Format
PDR.....	Preliminary Design Review
PEA	Program Element Appendix
PI.....	Principal Investigator
PIC	Procurement Information Circular
PIMMC	Principal Investigator-Managed Mission Cost
PLRA	Project Level Requirements Agreement
PM.....	Project Manager
PMC	Program Management Council
PMW	Potential Major Weakness
PNT.....	Position, Navigation, and Timing
POC.....	Point of Contact
PPP.....	Project Protection Plan
PS	Project Scientist
PSD	Program Specific Data
PSE.....	Project Systems Engineer
REC.....	Record of Environmental Consideration
RF.....	Radio Frequency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RHU	Radioisotope Heater Unit
ROD	Record of Decision
ROM	Rough Order-of-Magnitude
ROSES	Research Opportunities in Space and Earth Sciences
RPS	Radioisotope Power System
R&R	Recruitment and Retention
RTG.....	Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator
RUG	Rideshare User's Guide
RY	Real Year
SALMON.....	Stand Alone Missions of Opportunity Notice
SAM.....	System for Award Management
SB.....	Small Business
SC.....	Student Collaboration
SCaN.....	Space Communications and Navigation
SCG.....	Security Classification Guide
SDB.....	Small Disadvantaged Business
SDVOSB.....	Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business
SE.....	System Engineer(ing)
SEO.....	Science Enhancement Option
SI.....	International System of Units

S&MA.....	Safety and Mission Assurance
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SMD.....	Science Mission Directorate
SMP.....	Software Management Plan
SN	Space Network
S/N	Signal to Noise
SOC.....	Science Operations Center
SOMA.....	Science Office of Mission Assessments
SOW.....	Statement of Work
SPA	Secondary Payload Adapter
SPASE.....	Space Physics Archive Search and Extract
SPD	SMD Policy Document
SPG	Strategic Planning Guidance
SRR.....	System Requirements Review
SSMS	Safety, Security, and Mission Services
SSP.....	System Security Plan
STDT.....	Science and Technology Definition Team
STEM.....	Science, Technology, Engineering and Math
STI.....	Scientific and Technical Information
STM	Science Traceability Matrix
STP.....	Solar Terrestrial Probe
TA	Technical Authority
TAA	Technical Assistance Agreement
TDO	Technology Demonstration Opportunity
TMC.....	Technical, Management, and Cost
TPM	Technical Performance Metric
TRL.....	Technology Readiness Level
UARC	University Affiliated Research Center
URL.....	Uniform Resource Locator
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.....	United States Code
VADR.....	Venture-Class Acquisition of Dedicated and Rideshare
VOSB.....	Veteran Owned Small Business
WBS.....	Work Breakdown Structure
WOSB.....	Women Owned Small Business
WYE	Work Year Equivalent

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

