



ISS NATIONAL LABORATORY®
CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE IN SPACE

CASIS Multiphase Proposal Evaluator Instructions

Center for the Advancement of Science in Space
1005 Viera Boulevard, Suite 101, Rockledge, FL 32955

Last Updated: January 15, 2025

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Purpose..... | 1 |
| 2 | Overview of the Evaluation Process | 1 |
| 2.1 | <i>Objective of the Evaluation Process.....</i> | <i>1</i> |
| 2.2 | <i>Lines of Business.....</i> | <i>2</i> |
| 2.3 | <i>Evaluation Categories</i> | <i>2</i> |
| 3 | Scoring Explanation | 4 |
| 4 | Descriptions of Evaluation Criteria by Category | 8 |
| 4.1 | <i>Scientific and Technical Merit</i> | <i>8</i> |
| 4.2 | <i>Implementation Feasibility.....</i> | <i>9</i> |
| 4.3 | <i>Operations and ISS Utilization.....</i> | <i>11</i> |
| 4.4 | <i>Business and Economic Merit</i> | <i>12</i> |
| 4.5 | <i>STEM Engagement.....</i> | <i>13</i> |
| | Appendix – Evaluation Criteria Weighting Factors by Line of Business | 15 |

1 Purpose

This document is intended to guide proposal evaluators in assessing International Space Station (ISS) National Laboratory flight proposals submitted to the Center for the Advancement of Science in Space (CASIS). As the manager of the ISS National Lab, CASIS is responsible for selecting research and development (R&D); technology development/demonstration; and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education proposals for flight implementation. Individual evaluators are part of an overall process described in this document and provide inputs that form the basis for selection. Using this document, evaluators should be able to complete an individual proposal evaluation and specific panel evaluations for relevant proposals.

2 Overview of the Evaluation Process

2.1 Objective of the Evaluation Process

The objective of the proposal evaluation process is to assist the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer in determining which of the many proposals received in response to a solicitation best demonstrate an appropriate and effective utilization of the ISS National Lab, a publicly funded asset with unique capabilities and limited capacity. To aid in determination for the many and diverse types of proposals received, instructions are provided to each proposing entity to assist in their development of a proposal that clearly states the experimental design, execution plan, and support requirements.

Proposals are evaluated along four “lines of business,” which are strategic focus areas of the ISS National Lab: 1) fundamental science, 2) in-space production applications, 3) STEM education and workforce development, and 4) technology development/demonstration (see section 2.2 for additional description). Each line of business has a specific proposal evaluation framework so that proposals with similar characteristics are evaluated within a common framework. The framework is intentionally transparent, with specific criteria communicated to offerors.

Within the evaluation framework for each line of business, proposals are evaluated using scoring of criteria that fall under the following categories: scientific and technical merit, implementation feasibility, operations and ISS utilization, business and economic merit, and STEM Education and Workforce Development (see section 2.3 for additional description). All five categories may not be applicable to all lines of business, and proposals are evaluated only by the categories relevant to their assigned line of business. Each category has a rubric-based scoring Excel worksheet to determine a raw score for that category. For each line of business, the criteria in each category are weighted based on the expected strength of that criteria for that particular line of business. Weighting is applied based on expected proposal content and detail, depending on the line of business.

For the evaluation of a given proposal, a panel of individual evaluators are assigned to each evaluation category applicable to the proposal’s line of business. Each evaluator reviews and scores the proposal based on the scoring rubric for each criterion within that category. In addition, evaluators are asked to provide the overall strengths and weaknesses of the proposal to substantiate the rubric score. Finally, evaluators are asked to identify “notable features” that will help the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer identify high-risk, high-reward proposals that may not have scored well but have high potential. Evaluators document their scoring, along with their justification and

any notable features, on an Excel worksheet (the Evaluator’s Workbook) provided with these instructions.

The scoring for each evaluation category helps establish the basis for an adjectival rating for the category on a scale from “poor” to “excellent” (see section 3 for additional description). If there is a wide discrepancy in the scoring for a category, the panel of evaluators assigned to that category will be asked to participate in a CASIS-facilitated virtual panel meeting to determine a consensus evaluation for the category. Once a consensus adjectival rating is established for each category, a panel integration team is formed to determine an overall adjectival rating for the proposal across all applicable categories (see Figure 5 in section 3 of this document). These adjectival ratings are used by the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer to determine which proposals will be selected for award.

Note: *Decision-making is a creative and dynamic way of reaching agreement in a group. Instead of simply voting for an item and having the majority decide, a consensus group is committed to finding solutions that everyone actively supports or, at a minimum, finds acceptable.*

2.2 Lines of Business

The specific line of business a proposal is submitted under determines how the proposal is evaluated. The proposal instructions, evaluation categories, and criteria weighting for a proposal differ by line of business. The applicable line of business for a proposal is determined by the submitting organization based on the following definitions:

Fundamental Science: Peer-reviewed science that will lead to new discovery and knowledge, or advance our current understanding or knowledge, in various scientific disciplines through the use of microgravity, the extreme environments of space, or the unique vantage point of the ISS. Economic output from project results is not required.

In-Space Production Applications: Low Earth orbit (LEO)-based applied R&D microgravity applications seeking to demonstrate space-based manufacturing and production activities that enable new business growth and capital investment, represent scalable and sustainable market opportunities, and produce reoccurring value with the potential to generate demand for and revenue from access to space.

STEM Education and Workforce Development: Programs, projects, and public-private partnerships that leverage the ISS and space-based research to advance U.S. leadership in space-based R&D and industry-related workforce development. Programs/partnerships should seek to extend the learning community, build a STEM-capable workforce, and include opportunities for post-secondary students, K-12 students, and/or educators while targeting underrepresented demographics.

Technology Development/Demonstration: Applied R&D, technology demonstration, and technology readiness level (TRL) maturation to improve products and/or processes that will produce positive economic impact. All projects with an expressed commercial purpose or intent are included. Most of these will be sourced and/or serviced by Implementation Partners.

2.3 Evaluation Categories

There are five evaluation categories, and each line of business is evaluated across either three or four categories. Some categories do not apply to some lines of business, and the criteria within each category

are weighted differently depending on the line of business (see Table in Appendix A). The evaluator's role will focus on one of the following categories, as requested:

Scientific and Technical Merit: This category evaluates the fundamental scientific investigation or technology maturation merit, including goals, objectives, level of innovation, programmatic value, analysis merit, likelihood of success, risk, and the basis and justification for use of microgravity, the extreme environments of space, or the unique vantage point of the ISS. High-scoring proposals will have a clearly defined scientific purpose and a well-designed scientific investigation or technology maturation plan. Implementation is not a scoring criterium in this category. This category is used for the evaluation of proposals in the following lines of business: in-space production applications, technology development/demonstration, and fundamental research.

Implementation Feasibility: This category evaluates the quality and feasibility of the implementation approach, including the design and plan for operations, suitability for addressing objectives, management approach, schedule, cost, offeror expertise and prior performance, risk, and whether the implementation would overcome strategic and operational barriers to increase the offeror's access to space-based facilities. This category is used for the evaluation of proposals in all four lines of business.

Operations and ISS Utilization: This category evaluates the readiness for operations and appropriate utilization of scarce ISS resources, including power, mass, volume, and interface requirements; installation and operations impact on ISS crew time; hazards; regulatory compliance; data collection and downlink needs; and whether the project offramp or completion criteria are defined and consistent with ISS operations sustainability. This category is used for the evaluation of proposals in all four lines of business.

Business and Economic Merit: This category evaluates the market potential and application leverage of the potential solution, including market scalability and leveragability, market disruption, incremental revenue, financial commitments, and whether the project has a feasible commercialization plan and customer engagement. This category is used for the evaluation of proposals in the following lines of business: in-space production applications and technology development.

STEM Education and Workforce Development: Evaluates the quality of the plan for STEM education and workforce development, including the STEM education goals and/or workforce development outcomes, degree of experiential learning, social impact (including demographics of outcomes), assessment and measurement plans, likelihood of success, and degree to which partnerships are utilized. This category is only used for the evaluation of proposals in the STEM education and workforce development line of business.

If a category is evaluated using multiple evaluators, an evaluator panel will be convened. Each panel member will score the proposal, as described in section 3 of this document, and the panel will determine a consensus adjectival rating.

Figure 1 below depicts the process flow for each line of business through the evaluation categories.




Figure 1: Proposal Evaluation by Line of Business

Once a consensus adjectival rating is achieved for each evaluation category, the proposal moves on to the panel integration team. The role of this team is to integrate the adjectival ratings for all evaluation categories applicable to a proposal, formulate an overall proposal adjectival rating, collate notable features, assess resource requirements relative to value, synthesize an overall risk assessment, prepare recommendations for the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer, and convey feedback to offerors.

3 Scoring Explanation

Using the provided Evaluator's Workbook (Excel file), evaluators should begin their evaluation on the "Proposal Summary" workbook tab, as shown in Figure 2. Evaluators should start by filling in the appropriate proposal name as well as their name and organization as the evaluator. To select the line of business for the proposal, evaluators should click on the arrow to the right of the blank cell and choose the appropriate line of business from the drop-down menu.

| Proposal Evaluation | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Proposal | | |
| Organization | | |
| Evaluator | | |
| Line of Business | | Technology Development |
| Science & Technology | | |
| Implementation Feasibility | | |
| Operations & ISS Utilization | | |
| Business & Economic | | |
| STEM Education & Workforce Development | | NOT RELEVANT |
| WEIGHTED TOTAL | | |

Figure 2: Proposal Summary

For each proposal, evaluators should review for their assigned evaluation category in accordance with the criteria identified in section 4 of this document. The Evaluator's Workbook includes rubric tabs for each evaluation category to assist in the scoring along a scale from zero (noncompliant) to five

(exceptional). A score of zero is indicative of a noncompliant response to the evaluation criteria and may, of itself, cause a proposal to be rejected, so evaluators are asked to use this score sparingly.

As shown in Figure 3, the rubric provides the criteria in column “A.” Column “B” cross references the criteria identifier from section 4 of this document, which provides descriptions of the criteria by category. Evaluators should enter their scores in column “I.”

| ISS National Lab Science & Technology Panel - Proposal Evaluation Rubric | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|-------------|
| Proposer Organization | | Scoring scales | | | | | Evaluator 0 | | TOTAL SCORE |
| | | | | | | | Line of Business | Technology Development | |
| | | Non-Compliant (-0) | Poor (-1) | Fair (-2) | Good (+3) | Very Good (+4) | Excellent (+5) | | |
| Criteria to be assessed | Clearly defined science/technology question addressing expected advancement(s) | A-1 | No science or technology maturation question posed. | Science/technology question is posed in a general manner. | Science/technology question is specific. Existing state of the art and/or current TRL is discussed. | Question is specific and addresses at a minimum relevance and achievability. Technology maturation defines current state of the art or TRL. | Question is specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. In addition, technology maturation defines starting and ending TRL. | Question is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-based. In addition, technology maturation defines starting and ending TRL and steps to achieve advancement. | 0.00 |
| | Compelling nature and priority of the science or technology objectives | A-2 | Science or technology objectives not stated | Science or technology objectives are clearly stated but may lack compelling basis. No evidence is provided to substantiate priority. | Stated objectives are not prioritized but represent a somewhat compelling line of investigation or technology maturation approach. | Stated objectives are a compelling investigation/technology maturation and are internally prioritized. | Stated objectives are highly compelling and directly related to organizationally documented priority investigation/technology maturation. | Stated objectives are directly related to high priority science or technology objective documented in external strategy (decadal surveys, agency S&Gs, or agency strategy). | 0.00 |
| | Innovation, multidisciplinary integration, and novelty of approach | A-3 | No evidence of innovation, multiple disciplines or novelty provided | The proposal provides at least one novel or innovative factor. | The proposal has no novel investigation or innovative technology but leverages at least two disciplines. | The proposal provides a somewhat novel line of investigation or a innovative technology within a discipline. | The proposal provides a substantially novel line of investigation or a unique innovative technology, leveraging at least two disciplines. | The proposal represents a novel line of investigation or unique technology through integration of multiple disciplines. | 0.00 |
| | Programmatic value of proposed project | A-4 | The project likely overlaps with other efforts and is not unique. | | N/A | The project includes unique science or technology progress but is not coordinated with other planned missions. | The project includes unique science or technology progress and is coordinated with at least one other project. | The project includes unique science or technology progress in the context of other ongoing and planned missions and may be related to other elements of the ISS National Lab portfolio. | 0.00 |
| | Likelihood of science or technology advancement | A-5 | The project is highly unlikely to achieve success, and/or there | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives | The project is likely to meet the scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. | 0.00 |
| Enter scores | | | | | | | | | |

Figure 3: Rubric Scoring

The “Total Score” in cell J2 of each sheet is calculated based on a line of business-specific weighting schema. So, for any given set of criteria scores, the “Total Score” may be calculated differently for proposals in different lines of business. The weighting schema for each line of business is available for review in the “Weights” workbook tab.

Scores **must** be substantiated by one or more strengths and/or weaknesses. Strengths should be entered in column “K,” and weaknesses in column “L” (see Figure 4 below). A well-written strength will reference the criteria standard (see section 4 of this document), citing the proposal page number that exceeds the standard. A well-written weakness will either state that the proposal fails to address the criteria or state how the proposal (cite page numbers) falls short of the standard. It is possible for both strengths and weaknesses to be documented for any given criterion. A score of 1 (poor) or 2 (fair) should have one or more substantiating weakness statements that are more significant than any strength statements. A score of 4 (very good) or 5 (excellent) should have one or more substantiating strength statements that are more significant than any weakness statements. A score of 3 (good) should have strength and weakness statements that essentially balance.

| Evaluation Rubric | | | | | Strength and Weakness Statements | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Evaluator 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Line of Business Technology Development | | | | | | | | |
| Fair (=2) | Good (=3) | Very Good (=4) | Excellent (=5) | Sci Panel Score | Weighted score | Strength/Justification | Weakness/Justification | Notable Features (Intangible) |
| Question is specific and addresses at a minimum relevance and achievability. Technology maturation defines current state of the art or TRL. | Question is specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. In addition, technology maturation defines starting and ending TRL. | Question is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-based. In addition, technology maturation defines starting and ending TRL and steps to achieve advancement. | Question is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-based. In addition, technology maturation defines starting and ending TRL and steps to achieve advancement. | | 0.00 | | | |
| Stated objectives are not prioritized but present a somewhat compelling line of investigation or technology maturation approach. | Stated objectives are a compelling investigation/technology maturation and are internally prioritized. | Stated objectives are highly compelling and directly related to organizationally documented priority investigation/technology maturation. | Stated objectives are directly related to high-priority science or technology objective as documented in external strategy (decadal surveys, agency SKGs, or agency strategy). | | 0.00 | | | |
| The proposal has no novel investigation or innovative technology leverages at least two disciplines. | The proposal provides a somewhat novel line of investigation or a unique innovative technology within a discipline. | The proposal provides a substantially novel line of investigation or a unique innovative technology, leveraging at least two disciplines. | The proposal represents a novel line of investigation or unique technology through integration of multiple disciplines. | | 0.00 | | | |
| N/A | The project includes unique science or technology progress but is not coordinated with other planned missions. | The project includes unique science or technology progress and is coordinated with at least one other project. | The project includes unique science or technology progress in the context of other ongoing and planned missions and may be related to other elements of the ISS National Lab portfolio. | | 0.00 | | | |
| The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. | The project may achieve scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. | The project is likely to meet the scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. | | | | | |

Figure 4: Strength and Weakness Statements

Please carefully capture the strength and weakness rationale, as these statements are used by the panel integration team to synthesize selection recommendations and prioritization. Strengths and weaknesses may be shared with offerors during a debrief to assist them in preparing better proposals in the future.

Additionally, evaluators should use column “M” to record any “notable features” that may help the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer identify high-risk, high-reward proposals that may not have scored well in the rubric but may have high potential. These comments are for the final determination committee’s consideration and will not be shared with offerors unless specifically permitted by the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer.

Based on the rubric scoring from evaluators, an adjectival rating (excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor) will be assigned for each category. Figure 5 shows the score-based guide referenced in assigning adjectival ratings, along with the corresponding strengths and weaknesses that would be supportive of each rating.

In the case that there is a wide discrepancy in the technical scoring for Scientific and Technology Merit, the panel of evaluators assigned to that category will be asked to participate in a CASIS-facilitated panel meeting to determine a consensus adjectival rating for the category.

In the panel meeting, evaluators will be provided with the score-based adjectival rating guide shown in Figure 5 as a basis for their discussion. However, it is important to note that evaluators are *not* bound by the rubric scoring to formulate the consensus adjectival rating. The score-based adjectival rating guide is based on experience scoring proposals, but the panel of evaluators are not constrained to that method of rating during the panel meeting.

| Score | Adjectival Rating | Strengths and Weaknesses |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| >85-100 | Excellent | A truly outstanding proposal. Few, if any, weaknesses are noted, and there are many strengths. A proposal with this rating should be compelling and a top-tier effort. |
| >75-85 | Very Good | A better-than-average proposal. Strengths outweigh weaknesses, and there are no meaningful noncompliant criteria responses. A proposal of this rating would have attractive features noted in strengths that would easily justify selection. |
| >65-75 | Good | An acceptable proposal. Weaknesses and strengths are essentially balanced. Any noncompliant criteria responses are easily correctable. A proposal rated as “Good” in all categories would be “on the cusp” for selection. |
| >50-65 | Fair | A marginal proposal. Weaknesses outweigh strengths (perhaps significantly). The evaluation may identify noncompliant criteria responses, but these should be correctable with additional effort by the offeror or Implementation Partner. |
| 0-50 | Poor | A non-selectable proposal. Few if any strengths and many weaknesses, some of which may include uncorrectable noncompliant criteria responses. |

Figure 5: Score-Based Adjectival Rating Guide

The end result of the panel meeting is to provide a consensus adjectival rating for the given category, along with consensus strengths and weaknesses and any “notable features” to report to the panel integration team, which will determine the overall rating for the proposal. The panel lead may provide raw rubric scores to the panel integration team for use in formulating recommendations, but these scores will not be provided to the CASIS final determination committee and chief executive officer, nor will they be included in any feedback to the offeror. Figure 6 below depicts the entire Panel Evaluation Process.




Figure 6: Panel Evaluation Process

4 Descriptions of Evaluation Criteria by Category

The following descriptions are provided to facilitate review of a proposal using the Evaluator's Workbook and should be used when scoring the criteria in the rubric. These descriptions are also supplied to offerors in the proposal submission instructions guide for the ISS National Lab. Strengths and weaknesses should be based on the degree to which the proposal is responsive to the criteria.

4.1 *Scientific and Technical Merit*

A-1, Clearly defined science/technology question and success criteria addressing expected advancement(s)

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to determine how well the offeror has stated the science/technology question and the associated success criteria necessary to achieve the maturation goals. How specific are these goals written in the proposal? Are they inherently measurable and achievable? Is a quantifiable success criterion based on the science or technology maturation goals included? How relevant is the scientific investigation or technology maturation? Are the time-based durations and any related events captured? For technology maturation projects, are the starting and ending technology readiness levels (TRL) and steps to achieve advancement identified?

A-2, Compelling nature and priority of the science or technology objectives

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to determine the compelling nature of the project. Are the stated objectives directly related to high-priority science or technology maturation goals? For the fundamental science line of business, the objectives would ideally be related to a documented external strategy (e.g., decadal surveys, agency Strategic Knowledge Gaps (SKGs), etc.). For the in-space production applications and technology development lines of business, the objectives could be related to external industry objectives or an internal corporate strategy and should address an approach to scale the proposed technology to achieve a production-level process.

A-3, Innovation, multidisciplinary integration, and novelty of approach

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to determine the degree of novelty or innovation of the project. How unique is the technology considered for maturation, or how novel is the line of investigation; or how innovative is the proposed technology? The offeror should include enough technical background for the evaluators to sufficiently understand the research or technology proposed and its significance relative to the current state of the art. Additional credit is given to proposals that integrate multiple disciplines. This criterion can be thought of as the "inherent value" of the project. Were inclusion, diversity, equity, and accessibility (IDEA) concepts incorporated in a meaningful way? Alternatively, the offeror may focus the response to this criterion on how the project relates to internal product and business strategy.

A-4, Programmatic value of proposed project

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the project advances unique science or technology in the context of other ongoing and planned missions. A key exemplar would be the project's relationship to the other elements of the ISS National Lab portfolio. Outside evaluators may or may not have insight into the specifics of the ISS National Lab portfolio but are asked to score this criterion within the scope of national space investments. Because this is an extrinsic criterion, lack of proposal discussion is not necessarily a reason to score this criterion poorly.

A-5, Likelihood of science or technology advancement success

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the project is likely to meet the scientific investigation or technology maturation goals and objectives. Specifically, are the proposed mission requirements appropriate for guiding development and ensuring success? Is the experimental (or technology maturation) design likely to lead to success? Will the IDEA concepts introduced contribute to the project's success? Because this is an extrinsic criterion, lack of proposal discussion is not necessarily a reason to score this criterion poorly.

A-6, Merit of data results/analysis plan

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to determine whether data to be collected by the scientific investigation or technology maturation is fully adequate to assess the project's success, at a minimum using postmortem collected data. For multiphase projects only, is sufficient time provided in the Technology Roadmap to adequately assess results as the program transitions from phase to phase? Does the proposal clearly state what data will be collected? Does the proposal include a detailed plan for data analysis or material characterization that is quantifiable and directly relevant to the stated project success criterion? A higher-scoring proposal would also address whether data analysis allows monitoring during project execution to allow for in-flight adjustment. The offeror should also have plans for a broad presentation of results, consistent with Intellectual Property (IP) constraints, after the conclusion of the project.

A-7, Scientific basis and justification for exploitation of microgravity, the extreme environments of space, or the unique vantage point of the ISS

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to establish whether the scientific investigation or technology maturation can only be achieved through well-substantiated requirements for microgravity, persistent exposure to the low Earth orbit environment, or the unique ISS vantage point. If the proposed project could achieve substantively the same scientific or technical objectives on the ground, via sounding rocket, high-altitude balloon, reduced-gravity aircraft testing, computer simulation, artificial intelligence, or other mechanisms, this criterion should not be awarded a high score.

4.2 Implementation Feasibility

B-1, Adequacy and robustness of the project design and plan for operations

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposed implementation design of the scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM Education and Workforce Development, will address the offeror's goals and objectives. Do project success criteria (for conduct and operations) demonstrate the necessary and sufficient evidence to complete the project? For multiphase projects only, does the Technology Roadmap align with and/or define the plan? High-scoring proposals will clearly establish success thresholds.

B-2, Suitability of proposed hardware, software, and facilities to address objectives

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the offeror's flight hardware, software, and facilities are necessary and sufficient to complete the scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM education and workforce development design as envisioned. Evaluations that identify inappropriate resources, shortfalls, or necessary hardware, software, or facilities that are not mentioned in the proposal should award lower scores.

B-3, Adequacy and robustness of the management approach and schedule

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to determine whether the proposal identifies key personnel, including a principal investigator (PI) for scientific investigations or a project manager (PM) and establishes a clear and reasonable organizational structure. Further, in cases when a Technology Roadmap is required, evaluators should determine whether the timeline of activities (Gantt chart, flow chart, diagrams, etc.) in the roadmap clearly describes the plan to successfully execute the preflight, flight, and postflight segments of each phase of the project. To achieve the maximum score, the proposal should include a credible and detailed program schedule, including Implementation Partner interactions.

B-4, Well-defined and credible cost of the project

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposed project's costs are fully described in the proposal with a detailed, substantive, and time-phased budget. High-scoring proposals should substantiate budget lines with a credible basis of estimate and identify adequate management reserves.

B-5, Offeror and Implementation Partner experience, expertise, and record of performance

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the offeror's documented experience, expertise, and history of the project team, including the Implementation Partner. Is the offeror and Implementation Partner's past performance highly relevant to the proposed scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM education and workforce development? Does the Implementation Partner (if applicable) have experience with similar ISS flight projects, and does that experience suggest a high likelihood of implementation success? High-scoring proposals should define roles and responsibilities of key performers and/or collaborators and provide appropriate biographical sketches.

B-6, Uniqueness of implementation relative to ISS R&D tools available to the offeror

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal clearly identifies how the selected ISS R&D tools are uniquely capable of achieving the scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM education and workforce development goals. Offerors should distinguish tools currently or soon-to-be available on the ISS (this criterion) from the requirement for the project to be performed using the ISS (criterion A-7). For example, if modifying an ISS facility is proposed, but an existing ISS facility is available that could achieve the same science objectives, this criterion should not be awarded a high score.

B-7, Implementation risk assessment and mitigation and quality assurance

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal identifies credible and complete risks and opportunities to implement the scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM education and workforce development. Proposals should not only identify the probability of occurrence and consequence of the risk but also define mitigation and quality assurance plans tied to project milestones. For multiphase projects only, risk and mitigations may be addressed in the Technology Roadmap. Quality assurance should be addressed in the Implementation Partner's Statement of Work and the offeror's data management plan, where appropriate.

4.3 Operations and ISS Utilization

C-1, Potential ISS hazards are identified, and control techniques are provided

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal identifies potential ISS hazards clearly and completely with a relevant basis. For offerors new to the ISS environment, this criterion will largely be demonstrated by the Implementation Partner. For high-scoring proposals, hazard mitigation activities (Implementation Partner or internal) should be identified, scheduled, and costed.

C-2, Installation and operations impacts on ISS crew time are defined and sustainable

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal's crew time estimates for installation and operation are reasonable, realistic, detailed, and credible. High-scoring proposals will show estimates of these times, substantiated by a basis of estimate.

C-3, Operational status and suitability of support equipment, logistics, and consumables

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal identifies detailed support equipment, ground support equipment (laboratories, test facilities, analysis tools), logistics leading up to flight, and consumable information, if relevant. The offeror's support equipment and data analysis tools should be credible and demonstrated to be necessary, including any needed ground analysis of return samples. This criterion is independent of ISS utilization and may score a "5" if no ground sustainability is necessary.

C-4, Mass, volume, power, and interface requirements are defined and sustainable

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal clearly identifies and substantiates launch and return mass and volume, power (ascent, in-orbit, descent), and ISS interface requirements. Requirements should be supported by specific basis of estimates. Evaluators should assess whether the project needs are sustainable by ISS operations. Finally, any downmass requirements should be identified and reasonable.

C-5, External regulatory policies are identified and addressed

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal clearly identifies all necessary regulatory policies (e.g., biomedical, human tissue, Earth observation, etc.) exclusive of NASA policies or provides a rationale if no regulatory policies apply. High-scoring proposals should identify reasonable and timely plans for regulatory approval.

C-6, Data collection/downlink plan is defined and sustainable

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal identifies data collection, storage, and downlink plans in the Data Management Plan. Evaluators should assess whether these plans are sustainable by ISS services. Data collection plans should support the scientific investigation, technology maturation, or STEM education and workforce development objectives.

C-7, Completion criteria are defined and consistent with ISS operations

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal identifies entry and exit criteria that align with the research objectives for project completion. Are minimum success criteria described? High-scoring proposals should identify both continuation and early disposal alternatives for project disposition that are sustainable by the ISS. Very rarely, a project may have no opportunities for

either early termination or continuation (for example, external radiation samples) and may be scored a “5.”

4.4 Business and Economic Impact

D-1, Project outcomes can be deployed to serve sizable addressable markets (scalability)

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the total addressable market (TAM)—the overall revenue opportunity that is or is expected to be available to a product or service resulting from this study if 100% market share is achieved—for the solution or product resulting (directly or indirectly) from this project. Is the method of calculation identified? The highest-scoring proposals should provide a TAM of \$1 billion or higher.

D-2, Ability to leverage project outcomes across multiple applications, customers, or needs

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the product/solution or technology maturation is designed so that outcomes may address each or some of the following: multiple applications, needs, customers, and markets. Lower-scoring proposals will not be leverageable in several of these dimensions.

D-3, Project results in technology/products/solution innovation and/or market disruption

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the project represents or materially supports a unique innovation that will likely disrupt the targeted markets discussed in D-1. High-scoring proposals should provide supporting evidence, including comparison to currently available, best-in-class competing alternatives, to substantiate that developed products or solutions will likely gain significant competitive advantage and have high potential to win significant (10% or more for the highest score) market share.

D-4, Project leads to execution of specific business, regulatory, and product milestones during its execution and incremental revenue after completion

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the revenue expectations resulting from solutions/products developed as a result of each phase and at the completion of this project are well substantiated. The proposal should credibly identify expected incremental revenues and achievement timelines with supporting information. The proposal needs to provide supporting information on unit economics of the proposed product or solution to substantiate the pricing assumptions that are incorporated in the stated revenue estimates. The highest-scoring proposals should credibly predict incremental revenues of \$50 million or more per year, achieved within five years.

D-5, Sufficient internal/partner resource commitment is available per flight and overall

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether funding for this project, including external funding, is fully available and documented in applicable commitment letter(s). Matched funding is assumed not to be available unless specifically documented and attached as commitment letter(s) to the proposal. Note that this criterion assesses funding availability; cost realism is assessed in criterion B-4. The highest-scoring proposals will discuss the funding needed to complete and commercialize the results, identifying additional, quantifiable, and committed capital sources (whether internal or partner-provided) to meet this funding need.

D-6, Each phase of the project has feasible commercialization and customer engagement

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal provides a strong statement of market validation, customer engagement progress, and capabilities with a well-defined commercialization strategy and capabilities. The biographical sketches in the proposal should identify the business and operational management team for this project. The highest-scoring proposals will sufficiently summarize their financial/operational plan and/or a well-defined business plan and provide evidence of the team's relevant expertise in business/product development and financing. Highest-scoring proposals will also have the necessary organizational capabilities and resources to achieve the commercialization targets.

4.5 *STEM Education and Workforce Development*

E-1, STEM engagement goals and/or outreach outcomes are clearly defined

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the STEM engagement goals for direct participants are specific, clearly defined, and compelling. The proposal should identify outreach outcomes for broader demographics that are specified, planned, and address a well-defined target audience. Evaluators should assess the rationale for scaling/expanding existing programming.

E-2, Project advances U.S. leadership in space-based R&D and industry-related workforce development

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess whether the proposal provides a plan for student STEM academic pathway and career awareness/development that is clearly defined and comprehensive. The highest-scoring proposals should provide a link between this plan and the advancement of U.S. leadership in space-based R&D and industry-related workforce development.

E-3, Degree and scope of experiential learning provided by the project

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the proposal's STEM engagement and outreach is clearly defined, comprehensive, cohesive, and compelling. The highest-scoring proposals should be projects in which students are substantially involved in hands-on, problem-based learning representing at least 90% of the defined effort. Student experiential learning goals should be documented and tracked.

E-4, Outreach outcomes of the project provide social impact

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the project delivers social impact, such as building community, inclusion, and diversity. The highest-scoring proposals should proactively address disadvantaged demographics.

E-5, Likelihood of STEM engagement and/or outreach success

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the project is likely to achieve the anticipated project goals and objectives. Evaluators should examine whether mechanisms are in place to collect efficacy data. The highest-scoring proposals should include a comprehensive professional development strategy, including accreditation.

E-6, Merit and scope of STEM engagement assessment and outcome measurement plan

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the anticipated data to be collected for STEM engagement assessment is sufficient to complete the project and meet its goals and

objectives. Evaluators should examine the outcome measurement plan to assess whether the plan is robust and whether the outcomes can be measured using the collected data.

E-7, Degree to which partnerships are utilized in implementing STEM engagement plans

In scoring this criterion, evaluators are asked to assess the degree to which the proposal's STEM engagement involves multiple partner organizations that will provide significant funding and/or participation. The highest-scoring proposals should include a clearly defined, viable, and detailed plan to leverage partnerships to sustain the program.

Appendix – Evaluation Criteria Weighting Factors Multiphase NLRA

| | Fundamental Science | Technology Development/ Demonstration | In-Space Production Applications | STEM Education and Workforce Development | Multiphase Technology Development/ Demonstration |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Scientific and Technical Merit | | | | | |
| A-1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 |
| A-2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.1 |
| A-3 | 0.25 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.15 |
| A-4 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| A-5 | 0.1 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.25 |
| A-6 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| A-7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Implementation Feasibility | | | | | |
| B-1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.2 |
| B-2 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.15 |
| B-3 | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| B-4 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| B-5 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.25 | 0.1 |
| B-6 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0 | 0.15 |
| B-7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Operations and ISS Utilization | | | | | |
| C-1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| C-2 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| C-3 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.15 |
| C-4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| C-5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| C-6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.25 | 0.1 |
| C-7 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.1 |
| Business and Economic Impact | | | | | |
| D-1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.1 |
| D-2 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.05 |
| D-3 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.25 |
| D-4 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.2 |
| D-5 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 |
| D-6 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 |
| STEM Education and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| E-1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |
| E-2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| E-3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |
| E-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| E-5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| E-6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |
| E-7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |