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 Chapter as a guide.

2. Significant deviations from the provisions of this Handbook must be fully documented and be approved by the Program AA after concurrence by the Office of General Counsel and Office of Procurement.

## Chapter 5—The Selection Process

500 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 weak-nesses.	Report to Subcommittee.
Subcommittee	Science and technological relevance, value, and feasibility.	Categorization of individual 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.

## 501 Decisions To Be Made

- 1. 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. The selection official may develop additional data to make the following decisions:
- a. Determination of the adequacy of scientific/technical analysis supporting the recommended selections. This supporting rationale should involve considerations including:
- (1) Assurance that the expected return contributes substantially to program objectives and is likely to be realized.
- (2) Assurance that the evaluation criteria were applied consistently to all proposed investigations.
- (3) Assurance that the set of recommended investigations constitutes the optimum program or payload considering potential value and constraints.
- (4) 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.
- b. Determination as to whether available returned space hardware or support equipment, with or without modification, would be adequate to meet or support investigation objectives.
- c. Determination as to whether the proposed instrument fabricator qualifies and should be accepted as a sole source or whether the requirement should be competitive procured. The following guidelines apply:
- (1) The hardware required should be subjected to competitive solicitation where it is clear that the capability is not sufficiently unique to justify sole source procurement.
- (2) The hardware requirement should be purchased from the fabricator proposed by the investigator, which may be the investigator's own institution, (a) when the fabricator's proposal contains technical data

that are not available from another source, and it is not feasible or practicable to define the fabrication requirement in such a way as to avoid the necessity of using the technical data contained in the proposal; (b) when the fabricator offers unique capabilities that are not available from another source; (c) when the selection official determines that the proposed hardware contributes so significantly to the value of the investigator's proposal as to be an integral part of it.

(3) If a producer other than the one proposed by the investigator offers unique capabilities to produce the hardware requirement, NASA may buy the hardware from the qualified fabricator.

(4) If a NASA employee submits a proposal as a principal investigator, any requirement for hardware necessary to perform the investigation must either be competed by the installation procurement office or a justification must be written, synopsized, and approved in accordance with the requirements of FAR and the NFS.

d. Determination of the desirability for tentative selection of investigations. This determination involves considerations including:

- (1) Assessment of the state of development of the investigative hardware, the cost and schedule for development in relation to the gain in potential benefits at the time of final selection.
- (2) Assurance that there is adequate definition of investigation hardware to allow parallel design of other project hardware.
- (3) Assurance that appropriate management procedures are contained in the project plan for reevaluation and final selection (or rejection) on an appropriate time scale.
- e. Determination of the acceptability of the proposer's management plan, including the proposed hardware development plan, and the necessity, if any, of negotiating modifications to that plan.
- 2. In the process of making the above determinations described in subparagraph 1, the Program AA may request additional information or evaluations. In most instances, this information can be provided by the Program Office responsible for the mission, project, or program. However, the

Program AA may reconvene the subcommittee or poll the members individually or provide for additional analysis or require additional data from evaluators or proposers as considered necessary to facilitate the Program AA's decision.

## 502 The Selection Statement

Upon completion of deliberations, the responsible Program AA shall issue a selection statement. Ordinarily this statement will, upon request, be releasable to the public. As a minimum, the selection statement should include:

- 1. The general and specific evaluation criteria and relative importance used for the selection.
- 2. The categorizations provided by the subcommittee and the rationale for accepting or not accepting each Category I proposal and a succinct statement concerning the nonacceptance of all other proposals.
- 3. A concise description of each investigation accepted including an indication as to whether the selection is a partial acceptance of a proposal and/or a joinder with other investigators.
- 4. The role of the Principal Investigator with regard to hardware essential to the investigation and whether the Principal Investigator will be responsible for hardware acquisition and the basis therefor.
- 5. An indication of the plan and acquisition using the regular procurement processes, if the Principal Investigator is not to acquire the hardware.
- 6. A statement indicating whether the selection is final or tentative, recognizing the need for better definition of the investigation and its cost.
- 7. A statement indicating use of Government-owned space flight hardware and/or support equipment.

## 503 Notification of Proposers

1. It is essential that investigators whose proposals have no reasonable chance for selection be so apprised as soon as practicable. The responsible Program Office will, upon such determination, notify investigators of that fact with the major reason(s) why the proposals were so