Content Criteria Rubrics for Relevance and Merit

Relevance to NASA: For this program relevance will be evaluated according to:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance of the proposed mission concept to objectives as demonstrated by linkages between the mission concept objectives and the *2018 NASA Strategic Plan*	Investigation is not relevant to current NASA goals and objectives	Investigation is somewhat relevant to NASA	Investigation is relevant to high level NASA goals and objectives	Investigation is relevant to specific NASA Strategic Plan goals and objectives	Investigation is extremely relevant to specific NASA Strategic Plan goals and objectives or science or technology roadmaps

The proposing team must choose and specify to which element the proposed mission is relevant.

Merit: For this program, the evaluation of merit specifically includes realism and feasibility of the proposed study plan:

	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Nearly Meets Standard	Below Standard
Solution: overall system	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are clearly indicated. An extensive feasibility analysis is incorporated both for main solution concept as well as for its alternatives. Expected weight, dimensions, and total power consumption of the	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are indicated. There is a feasibility analysis incorporated to some extent. Expected weight, dimension, and total power consumption of the spacecraft are provided.	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are partially indicated. Feasibility analysis has been conducted vaguely. Expected weight, dimensions, total power consumption of the spacecraft are partially provided.	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are missing. There is no awareness of or concern about feasibility. Expected weight, dimensions, total power consumption, and etc. of the spacecraft are not provided.

	spacecraft are clearly provided.			
Requirements & Constraints	System level requirements&constraints and rationale are detailed and justified.	Requirements& constraints of the whole system are presented and justified; no more than 1-2 missing.	Many of the requirements and many constraints of the whole system are missing.	Requirements and contraints of the whole system are not provided or described very coarsely.
Mission concept of operations, design/architecture (trajectories etc)	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are clearly indicated.	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are indicated.	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are partially indicated.	Overall description of the system with a block diagram and system operation with a functional flow diagram are missing.
Spacecraft concept overall system	Expected weight, dimensions, and total power consumption of the spacecraft are clearly provided and related to requirements.	Expected weight, dimension, and total power consumption of the spacecraft are provided.	Expected weight, dimensions, total power consumption of the spacecraft are partially provided.	Expected weight, dimensions, total power consumption, and etc. of the spacecraft are not provided.
Preliminary payload, launch vehicle interface	Payload is clearly described and relevant to mission. Launch vehicle interface and deployment clearly outlined and reasoned.	Payload is clearly described. Launch vehicle interface and deployment described.	Either payload or launch vehicle plan is missing.	Neither payload or launch vehicle interface is defined.
Technology gaps/needs/development; Mission risks	Technology needs, quantified gaps, and development required are clear. A risk plot is included, with identification and rating of risks, and actions taken. Trade studies conducted to show how the selected design compares in feasibility, resilience, risk and probability of success to alternative designs.	Technology needs, quantified gaps, and development required are somewhat clear or implied. A risk plot is included, with identification and rating of risks, and actions taken. Trade studies cursory or not discussed.	Technology needs, quantified gaps, and development required are vague. A risk plot is missing. Risks are identified but not mitigated. Trade studies are not discussed.	Technology needs, quantified gaps, and development required are not addressed. Mission risks and trades are not addressed.