

**Frequently Asked Questions as of March 29, 2010 for
the "Announcement of CubeSat Launch Initiative - NNH10SOMD001L"**

1. Does the cubesat development have to be funded by a NASA project?

No, the CubeSat development does not have to be funded by NASA and this initiative does not provide any funding for such development. The CubeSat development does, however, have to be the result of efforts conducted under existing NASA-supported activities (solicitation section 3.1).

2. What is meant by "CubeSat development efforts conducted under existing NASA-supported activities"?

This pilot project is limited to CubeSats from educational and non-profit organizations for which there is an existing relationship with NASA (solicitation section 3.1). More specifically, the CubeSat must be the result of development efforts conducted by the educational or non-profit institution under existing NASA-supported activities, such as, but not limited to, the NASA Space Grant Consortium, Stand-Alone Missions of Opportunity Notice (SALMON) awards, or similar awards of financial assistance.

3. Does this initiative provide any funding to the CubeSat developer?

No, this initiative does not provide any funding to the CubeSat developer. It does not provide funding toward the development of any Cubesat, nor does this initiative provide funding to the CubeSat developer for the launch (solicitation section 1.0, 3.1). Rather, it provides a launch service (a launch opportunity plus integration of the CubeSat onto the launch vehicle) for the selected CubeSats. The costs of this launch service would be borne by NASA less the partial reimbursement of \$30,000 per 1U of volume from the proposer (solicitation section 1.0).

4. Having already done a technical merit review, should we be going back through the merit review process with the NASA strategic plans in mind? Should the review be accomplished by someone within NASA or just someone familiar with the proposal itself?

The Scientific, Educational, and/or Technical Merit Review(s) must have addressed both the scientific, educational, and/or technical quality of the investigation as well as alignment in addressing one or more of the NASA goals or objectives. The reviews do not have to have been conducted at the same time. The proposal must be able to demonstrate that merit reviews of both aspects were conducted (solicitation sections 3.2, 4.2.3). The reviews do not have to have been conducted by NASA personnel.

5. Under Feasibility Review, the announcement asks, "How was the technical development risk associated with the overall CubeSat mission assessed?" How technical is NASA interested in going? Should we go into a system by system overview of the Satellite or do you want to see a case by case basis for any point of failure on the satellite?

The proposal must provide a description of the feasibility review *process*, i.e. the method of assessing, cataloging, and dispositioning risks to the CubeSat design. A system-by-system overview or a case-by-case basis for any point of failure on the satellite is not required. However, the proposal should address the outcome of the feasibility review and responses to any recommendation(s) (solicitation section 4.2.4).

6. What kind of financial verification would NASA like to see, for internal CubeSat development?

A letter of commitment must be provided, signed by an authorized representative of the entity providing the development funds, stating that if selected, sufficient financial support for the remaining development of the CubeSat will be provided (solicitation section 5.0, Compliance Checklist).

7. What kind of financial verification would NASA like to see, for the \$30,000 to be paid toward integration costs?

Although not explicitly stated in the solicitation, a letter of commitment should be provided, signed by an authorized representative of the entity providing the funds, stating that, if selected, funding will be provided for the \$30,000 partial reimbursement of launch costs.

8. Who needs to conduct the merit review and the feasibility review? Also, how does the review process need to be documented or accredited?

It is not NASA's intention to specify how the merit and feasibility reviews are conducted. We require only that they have occurred. The proposal should describe the processes, including qualifications of review members, outcome, responses to any findings, etc. NASA will consider the factors identified in the solicitation when conducting the proposal evaluation (solicitation sections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4).

Evidence supporting the conduct of the reviews is at the discretion of the proposer. NASA is not specifying documentation required. Documented results/outcomes of the reviews can be included with the proposal in an Appendix.

9. Can 0.5 U CubeSats be considered under this Pilot program?

This pilot CubeSat selection will be limited to the standard sizes (1U, 2U and 3U). There are unique aspects of a two 0.5U CubeSat configuration which may be addressed after an analysis and assessment of this pilot effort.

10. Are U.S. organizations, only, invited to participate in this opportunity?

Yes (solicitation section 3.1)

11. What compliance documentation is needed to verify the sponsoring organization is a U.S. university?

No unique documentation is required for this purpose. Institutions of higher education submitting proposals must be listed in the U.S. Department of Education Database of Accredited Postsecondary Institutions. If there is a doubt, NASA will verify the institution with this list as part of the compliance

check. If selected, NASA will be negotiating and signing a legal agreement with the CubeSat developer and therefore might require more formal identification at that time.

12. To indicate funding commitment, is it sufficient to indicate in the text of the document that our CubeSat program is sponsored directly through the associated Space Grant Program?

Since funding could come from a variety of sources, NASA does need a letter of commitment, even if the funding is coming from your Space Grant Consortium.