(1) Approve the instrument specification.

(2) Advise the project manager in development and fabrication.

(3) Participate in final calibration.

(4) Develop and support the operations plan.

(5) Analyze and interpret the data.

(i) The Project Installation is responsible for implementing the program or project and should make recommendations concerning the role for the Principal Investigators. The Program AA will determine the role, acting upon the advice of the Headquarters Program Office and the Steering Committee. The Principal Investigator's desires will be respected in the negotiation of the person's role allowing an appeal to the Program AA and the right to withdraw from participation.

(j) The Program Office should make a presentation to the Steering Committee with supporting documentation on the decisions to be made by the responsible Program AA.

1872.406 Steering committee review.

(a) The most important role of the Steering Committee is to provide a substantive review of a potential payload or program of investigations and to recommend a selection to the Program AA. The Steering Committee applies the collective experience of representatives from the program and discipline communities and offers a forum for discussing the selection from those points of view. In addition to this mission-specific evaluation function, the Steering Committee provides guidance to subcommittee chairpersons and serves as a clearinghouse for problems and complaints regarding the process. The Steering Committee is responsible for assuring adherence to required procedures. Lastly, it is the forum where discipline objectives are weighed against program objectives and constraints.

(b) The Steering Committee represents the means for exercising three responsibilities in the process of selecting investigations to:

(1) Review compliance with procedures governing application of the AO process.

(2) Ensure that adequate documentation has been made of the steps in the evaluation process.

(3) Review the results of the evaluation by the subcommittee, Project, and Program Offices and prepare an assessment or endorsement of a recommended payload or program of investigations to the Program AA.

(c) The Purpose in exercising the first of the responsibilities in paragraph (b) of this section is to ensure equity and consistency in the application of the process. The Steering Committee is intended to provide the necessary reviews and coordination inherent in conventional acquisition practices.

(d) The second and third responsibilities of the Steering Committee in paragraph (b) are technical. They require that the Steering Committee review the evaluations by subcommittee, the Project Office, and the Program Office for completeness and appropriateness before forwarding to the Program AA. Most important in this review are:

(1) Degree to which results of evaluations and recommendations follow logically from the criteria in the AO.

(2) Consistency with objectives and policies generally beyond the scope of Project/Program Offices.

(3) Sufficiency of reasons stated for tentative recommendations of those investigations requiring further instrument research and development.

(4) Sufficiency of reasons stated for determining responsibilities for instrument development.

(5) Sufficiency of consideration of reusable space flight hardware and support equipment for the recommended investigations.

(6) Sufficiency of reasons for classifying proposed investigations in their respective categories.

(7) Fair treatment of all proposals.

(e) The Steering Committee makes recommendations to the selection official on the payload or program of investigations and notes caveats or provisions important for consideration of the selection official.

1872.407 Principles to apply.

(a) 1872.406 contains a description of the evaluation function appropriate for a major payload or very significant

program of investigation. The levels of review, evaluation, and refinement described should be applied in those selections where warranted but could be varied for less significant selection situations. It is essential to consider the principles of the several evaluative steps, but it may not be essential to consider the principles of the several evaluative steps, but it may not be essential to maintain strict adherence to the sequence and structure of the evaluation system described. The selection official is responsible for determining the evaluation process most appropriate for the selection situation using this subpart 1872.4 as a guide.

(b) Significant deviations from the provisions of this part 1872 must be fully documented and be approved by the Program AA after concurrence by the Office of General Counsel and Office of Acquisition.

Subpart 1872.5—The Selection Process

1872.501 General.

The Program AA is responsible for selecting investigations for contract negotiation. This decision culminates the evaluations and processes that can be summarized as follows:

Evaluation stage	Principal emphasis	Results
Contractor (when authorized)	Summary evaluation (strengths and weaknesses).	Report to Subcommittee.
Subcommittee individual	Science and technological relevance, value, and feasibility.	Categorization of proposals.
Project Office	Engineering/cost/integration/management assessment.	Reports to Subcommittee and Program Office.
Program Office	Consistency with Announcement and program objectives, and cost and schedule constraints.	Recommendations to Steering Committee of payload or program of investigations.
Steering Committee	Logic of proposed selections and compliance with proper procedures.	Recommendations to Program Associate Administrator.

1872.502 Decisions to be made.

(a) The selection decisions by the Program AA constitute management judgments balancing individual and aggregate scientific or technological merit, the contribution of the recommended investigations to the AO's objectives, and their consonance with budget constraints to make the following decisions:

(1) Determination of the adequacy of scientific/technical analysis supporting the recommended selections. This supporting rationale should involve considerations including:

(i) Assurance that the expected return contributes substantially to program objectives and is likely to be realized.

(ii) Assurance that the evaluation criteria were applied consistently to all proposed investigations.

(iii) Assurance that the set of recommended investigations constitutes the optimum program or payload considering potential value and constraints.

(iv) Assurance that only one investigator is assigned as the Principal Investigator to each investigation and that the Principal Investigator will assume the associated responsibilities and be the single point of contact and leader of any other investigators selected for the same investigation.

(2) Determination as to whether available returned space hardware or support equipment, with or without modification, would be adequate to meet or support investigation objectives.

(3) Determination as to whether the proposed instrument fabricator qualifies and should be accepted as a sole source or whether the requirement should be competitively procured. The following guidelines apply:

(i) The hardware required should be subjected to competitive solicitation where it is clear that the capability is not sufficiently unique to justify sole source acquisition.

(ii) The hardware requirement should be purchased from the fabricator proposed by the investigator, which may be the investigator's own institution,