



AO Simplification Overview

Paul Hertz

Senior Advisor, Science Mission Directorate

NASA Headquarters

paul.hertz@nasa.gov

[aosimplify @ nasa.gov](mailto:aosimplify@nasa.gov)



Objectives

- **Simplify** the proposal process to the extent possible to eliminate any unnecessary rules/requirements in the AO, and streamline the way that scientific and technical information is provided to NASA.
- **Reduce** or eliminate the amount of work that the proposing team has to do over and above what they would have to do anyway to have a credible response.
- **Revise** the AO/evaluation/selection process, as required, to reduce overall burden to the proposing community, the reviewing community, and NASA while maintaining or improving the present quality.



Constraints

The proposal process must still yield the following

- NASA must be able to readily evaluate the science merit of proposed missions (through science peer review) to guide selection.
 - NASA wants to select the most scientifically compelling missions.
- NASA must be able to readily evaluate the feasibility of proposed missions (through TMC review) to guide selection.
 - NASA wants to select missions that can be developed within the technical, cost, and schedule constraints.
- Mission teams, when selected, must be fully prepared to successfully conduct Phase A mission concept studies.
 - NASA wants to shorten the selection and downselection process as much as possible.



Methodology

- Concentrate first on PI-led mission AOs.
- Assemble internal working group to formulate recommendations and assess impacts.
 - NASA HQ/SMD: Paul Hertz (co-chair), Lisa May, Michael New
 - NASA LaRC/SSO: Brad Perry (co-chair), Jay Bergstrahl, Cindy Bruno, Wayne Richie
- Solicit community feedback and input.
- Develop recommendations and standard AO.
- Present report and recommendations to SMD Science Management Council and Associate Administrator Weiler for decision.
 - First impact is planned for New Frontiers AO in 2008.
 - Will consider revising SALMON AO in 2009 to incorporate results.



Methodology

- Community solicitation
 - Via FBO and newsletters
- Community Town Halls
 - DPS, AAS, LPSC science conferences
- Lessons Learned Workshops
 - February: Proposers
 - April: Cost/Schedule
 - April: Reviewers
- Draft Standard AO & White Paper
 - Community comment



Agenda

Thursday, April 17, 2008

- | | | |
|--------------|---|------------|
| 8:00 am | Registration & Breakfast | |
| 8:15 am | Welcome and introduction | Paul Hertz |
| 9:00 am | The goal of TMC cost & schedule evaluations of a Pre-Phase A project | |
| 10:30 am | BREAK | |
| | Discussion of the cost & schedule components of a Step 1 proposal | |
| 10:45 am | Proposed budget including cost tables, funding profile, and justification | |
| 12:00 noon | LUNCH (\$16 at on-site registration) | |
| 1:00 pm | Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and Master Equipment List (MEL) | |
| 2:00 pm | Schedule including I&T flow, critical path, milestones | |
| 3:15 pm | Workshop Summary | Paul Hertz |
| 3:30 pm | FORMAL ADJOURN | |
| 3:30-5:00 pm | Informal discussions | |



Logistics

- Logistics Lead Monica Washington



Cost/Schedule Lessons Learned Workshop Overview

Paul Hertz

Senior Advisor, Science Mission Directorate
NASA Headquarters
paul.hertz@nasa.gov

Brad Perry

Head, Science Support Office
NASA Langley Research Center
raleigh.b.perry@nasa.gov

[aosimplify @ nasa.gov](mailto:aosimplify@nasa.gov)



Statement of Task

- What data and other information do the evaluators need in order to provide a phase-appropriate evaluation of the proposed mission feasibility?
 - What can be eliminated without significantly impacting quality of evaluation?
- What data and other information is it reasonable at this phase for the proposing project team to provide?
 - What would any legitimate project be expected to know at this phase?
 - What is too much extra work? What is very little extra work?
- What is the appropriate level of detail and format for data to be provided?
 - When is standardization helpful? When is it overly constraining?



Ground Rules and Game Play

- NASA is looking for specific suggestions.
 - Philosophy was dealt with in February, and we only have one day.
- NASA is looking for responses to specific suggestions from the “other community” (proposers, evaluators) on the impact of specific suggestions.
 - Will this impact evaluation?
 - Is this unreasonable to require?
- For every topic: (a) What is the required content, (b) What is the appropriate level of detail that balances the maturity of Pre-Phase-A with NASA’s need to assess feasibility, and (c) What is the best format for submission?



Metric

1. Will it reduce work for the proposer?
2. Will it maintain NASA's ability to evaluate and select?
3. What is the downside risk?
4. Is it a good idea?



Ideas from Previous Workshop

- These have not been endorsed by NASA.
- Some will be incorporated into simplified Standard AO, some will not.
- At this workshop, we are looking for (a) additional ideas and (b) discussion of these ideas.



Ideas from Prior Workshop

- F-5 Request for cost data and confidence commensurate with detail of evaluation
- F-6 Clear budget templates and instructions on how to document costs
 - Standardize the AO cost tables in a single table using NPR 7120.5D WBS rather than Tables B2 and B3.
- F-8 Eliminate optional cost information (e.g. MEL, WBS, WBS Dictionary, BOE details, etc).
 - Decide what is needed for a Pre-Phase A proposal in order to enable cost evaluation, and require that and only that.
- F-10 All Costs submitted by single excel file
 - Allow the electronic cost tables to be submitted as multiple linked worksheets in a single excel file rather than requiring separate, unlinked excel files.



Ideas from Prior Workshop

- F-2 Eliminate funding profile in AO
- F-3 RY vs FY
 - For cost cap and proposed budget
- F-4 Get real about Impact of Inflation/Allow Forward Pricing vs Inflation Table
- F-9 Eliminate S Curves for Proposals
- F-11 Dictate cost estimating methodologies expected
- F-12 Define cost terminology and be consistent in usage
- F-7 Delete requirement for Phase A Statement of Work (SOW) proposal appendix.
 - Evaluate trade between simplifying the AO and speeding up the beginning of funded Phase A.



Ideas from Prior Workshop

C-18 Reconsider the Heritage Appendix

- There was mixed reaction as to whether the new heritage appendix is burdensome to create and whether it is a useful evaluation tool.

F-13 Is Table B8 required?

- Table B8 requires proposers to estimate FTE/WYE and direct costs for all categories of worker (civil servant, FFRDC, contractor, etc.) for every proposing institution.

F-14 Reduce Schedule Requirements (AI&T Flows)

F-15 Clarify level of Schedule Details needed.

C-15 Reduce Environmental Test Philosophy Requirements (flow, sequence, duration, etc)

- Need to specify level of detail required.



Metric

1. Will it reduce work for the proposer?
2. Will it maintain NASA's ability to evaluate and select?
3. What is the downside risk?
4. Is it a good idea?