December 19, 2025

To:

GSFC/Lazaros Oreopoulos	Project Scientist for Aqua
GSFC/Bryan Duncan	Project Scientist for Aura
JPL/Simon Hook	Principal Investigator for ECOSTRESS
JPL/Robert Green	Principal Investigator for EMIT
University of Maryland/Ralph Dubayah	Principal Investigator for GEDI
GSFC/George Huffman	Project Scientist for GPM
JPL/Felix Landerer	Project Scientist for GRACE-FO
GSFC/Tom Neumann	Project Scientist for ICESat-2
JPL/Vivienne Payne	Project Scientist for OCO-2
JPL/Abhishek Chatterjee	Project Scientist for OCO-3
University of Wisconsin/Tristan L'Ecuyer	Principal Investigator for PREFIRE
LaRC/David Flittner	Project Scientist for SAGE-III
JPL/Simon Yueh	Project Scientist for SMAP
Massachusetts Institute of Technology/Dara Entekhabi	Science Team Leader for SMAP
JPL/Lee-Lueng Fu	Project Scientist for SWOT
Smithsonian Astrophysics Institute/Xiong Liu	Principal Investigator for TEMPO
GSFC/Dong Wu	Project Scientist for TSIS-1

CC:

GSFC/L. Forbes	ESM Program Manager
JPL/S. Bard	ESM Program Manager
LaRC/R. Law	ESSP Program Manager

From: NASA HQ/K. St Germain/Director, Earth Science Division

Subject: Call for Proposals – Senior Review 2026 for Extension of Earth Science Operating Missions

NASA's Science Mission Directorate (SMD)/Earth Science Division (ESD) periodically conducts comparative reviews of on-orbit missions in extended operations to maximize the scientific return of the Earth Science mission fleet within finite resources, a process called the Senior Review for Extension of Operating Missions. NASA will use the findings from this comparative review to prioritize the operating missions, define an implementation strategy and give programmatic direction and budgetary guidelines to the missions and projects concerned for the next 3 fiscal years. Given ESD budget constraints, all missions proposing to the Senior Review will be given reduced budget targets. This Call describes the objectives and process for the review, including the scope, schedule and evaluation criteria, the Senior Review panels, and provides instructions for the preparation and submission of presentation proposals and in-person presentations to the review panel.

The following sixteen missions (in alphabetical order) are invited to propose to the 2026 Senior Review: Aqua, Aura, ECOSTRESS, EMIT, GEDI, GPM, GRACE-FO, ICESat-2, OCO-2, OCO-3, PREFIRE, SAGE-III, SMAP, SWOT, TEMPO, and TSIS-1.

Extended Mission Scope:
The period for this review will cover fiscal year (FY) 2027 through FY 2029.

ESD's priority for extended missions is the relevance of the extended dataset to ESD's Earth Science to Action Strategy, advancing Administration priorities (e.g., driving economic growth, increasing efficiency and agility, driving technology innovation and advancement, strengthening National, Regional, and Local Preparedness and Resilience, advancing Gold Standard Science, augmenting the Moon and Mars architecture, and achieving Artemis goals), and to meeting stakeholder needs for applications of unique data. The ESD Review also explicitly acknowledges (1) the uniqueness of the dataset among available global observations; (2) the direct

contributions of mission data to national objectives, such as the impactful use of data products from NASA research missions for applied and operational purposes; (3) the importance of long-term datasets and extending the observation record for Earth science research and societal applications, and availability of substitute data from other missions; and (4) the impact of funding mission extensions on ESD's capacity to develop future missions.

The basic mission should include the minimum necessary science review and assessment of instrument performance to verify and validate the data products. The proposal should clearly justify the level of science support required to maintain the quality of the datasets, including calibration and validation activities. Compared to the prime mission phase, algorithm maintenance is assumed to have become routine and fewer services to external data product users would be needed during the extended mission.

Mission operations coverage should provide for the safe management of the aging satellite and instruments, but compared to the prime mission phase, proposers are encouraged to propose and justify an increased risk of data collection degradation in exchange for an associated reduction in mission cost. For example, greater allowance for hands-off operations and longer data outages for anomaly response should be considered. It is expected that a continuous improvement process will result in reductions in the cost of established activities during the extended mission. Proposers are also encouraged to propose innovative measures to increase efficiency and/or reduce costs in aggregate during the extension period.

New higher-level product development and science investigations are not solicited through the Senior Review. Proposals of this nature are solicited through the ESD Research, Applied Sciences and ESDS Programs.

Evaluation Criteria

Each mission will be evaluated for science merit, applications and operational utility, technical and cost performance, according to the factors as described below.

- **Science:**
  - Scientific merit of the mission datasets with the proposed years of additional data collection, with special attention to the science that will be enabled by extension. Merit is based on the intrinsic value in investigations by the community into both answering Earth Science questions and enabling future applied uses, as well as contributions to ESD's Earth Science to Action Strategy (https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/earth-science-to-action/) and Administration priorities (e.g., driving economic growth, increasing efficiency and agility, driving technology innovation and advancement, strengthening National, Regional, and Local Preparedness and Resilience, advancing Gold Standard Science, augmenting the Moon and Mars architecture, and achieving Artemis goals).
    - Special weighting will be applied to new scientific knowledge that will be enabled by extension, and the uniqueness or irreplaceability of the data among available global observations for both research and applications.
  - Quality trends of the standard data products, with a focus on the projected quality for the years of the requested extension, including any change induced by sensor, platform or orbit changes, and the effect of such changes on the overall consistency of the dataset, recognizing the value of long-term datasets and overall data continuity for Earth science research and societal applications if substitute data from other missions is unavailable.
- **Operational, Applications, and Non-research Value**:
  - Utility and impact of the products for applied and operational uses that serve national interests, including operational uses, public services, business and economic uses, military operations, government management, policy making, etc. This includes the unique value of the investigation to make applications progress in the context of other ongoing and planned missions and the relationship to the other elements of NASA's science and applications programs.
  - Evaluation factors: intrinsic value, frequency of use, latency, private sector use.
- **Technical**
  - Innovative measures to increase efficiency and/or reduce costs in aggregate during the extension period.
  - Hardware status and performance, including life expectancy.

  - Mission operations plans for health, safety, and data collection.
- **Cost**
  - Cost performance based on historical expenses and allocated funds.

Funding Environment:
Missions proposing to the ESD Senior Review will compete for an allocation from a pool of funds comprised primarily of the budgets from all of the missions in extended phase. Given the dynamic and constrained budget solution space that the Agency is working within, the missions will be given significant cost challenges for both mission operations and data analysis and will be pending availability of funds in each of the fiscal years in the review window.

2026 Review Schedule
The schedule for the 2026 Earth Science Senior Review (all dates TBD):

Mission Team Pre-Proposal Briefing (Virtual):	*January 14, 2026*
Call for Proposals Issued:	*January 16, 2026*
National Interests Proposal Supplement Due:	*February 13, 2026*
Presentation Proposals Due:	*March 27, 2026*
Mission Presentation to Panel	*April 13-17, 2026*
Publication of the Panel's Report:	*May 2026*

The Senior Review Panel

The Senior Review is composed of one panel drawn from recognized expert members of the Earth Science research community, representatives from federal (and potentially state) government agencies, non-profit and commercial users of NASA research data, and NASA technical and cost experts. The panel will evaluate:

- the scientific merit of each mission's datasets with respect to NASA's Earth Science to Action Strategy and Administration priorities,
- the utility, applicability, and impact of the mission's data products to satisfy national objectives through non-research use for applied and operational purposes by non-NASA organizations,
- innovative measures proposed or implemented to increase efficiency and/or reduce costs in aggregate during the extension period,
- the health and viability of the operating satellites and/or instruments, and
- the proposed mission budgets.

Senior Review Panel meetings:

April 13-17, 2026:

Day 1: Review instructions, logistics, discussion of conflicts of interest and procedures to minimize their impacts. Project presentations.
Day 2: Project presentations.
Day 3: Project Presentations.
Day 4: Project Presentations.
Day 5: The Senior Review panel finalizes their evaluations, develops findings, and prepares an initial draft report.

Presentations to the Senior Review Panel:
Each proposing project will give an oral presentation to the panel with a maximum duration of 1 hour for the prepared presentation and an additional half an hour for questions from the panel. It is recommended that approximately 75% of the oral presentation focus on the science and applications section, with the remaining 25% dedicated to technical and cost considerations. Backup charts will not be part of the oral presentation, however, they may be referenced to address panel questions. The project team should be represented by no more than three people, or as negotiated with the Senior Review Program Officer.

Review Outcome:
The Senior Review Panel will produce a report of its findings. The Senior Review Panel will provide a mature draft of key findings and conclusions; the Panel chair will brief the ESD Director immediately following the

panel. Within six weeks, the panel will submit its final written report to ESD that will be posted later to a public NASA HQ web site.[1]

ESD will consider these findings along with programmatic and other considerations (orbital debris standards, data systems capacity, etc.) during the FY2028 budget formulation process before finalizing the mission extension decisions. ESD will then communicate the mission extension decisions to each of the proposing missions/projects. The decisions will include new budget guidance, if appropriate, programmatic guidance including possible notices of intent to terminate, and other specific instructions resulting from the Senior Review process. Each project must submit back to the ESD its plan for complying with the new guidance and instructions, including any documentation updates as required.

The Senior Review Program Officer will ensure that key officials in participating international space agencies or other U.S. government agencies that are partners in a proposing mission are kept informed of the Senior Review process and will be responsible for apprising our partners of NASA's decisions resulting from the Senior Review.

Instructions for Proposal Format and Content:
Each mission that is subject to this Senior Review and that is seeking to continue operations shall submit a presentation proposal outlining their mission implementation approach and proposed Project-supported data analysis (DA) for the fiscal years 2027-2029.

The proposal shall contain a science and applications, technical, and budget section in the main body of the presentation, and 4 sections in the backup including a mission data product inventory, budget spreadsheets, a list of acronyms, and an engineering data supplement.

There are no slide length requirements, however, projects should adhere to the 1-hour presentation duration and the approximate timing recommendations noted in the Presentations to the Senior Review Panel section above. The proposal must be submitted in PowerPoint format with the budget spreadsheets in Excel format (see below). (If your institution requires signatures, please place them on one separate submittal letter; copies of this submittal letter will not be used in the peer review but will be retained within the ESD. The project name and names of key authors at the top of the first slide will suffice for review purposes.) Proposal reviewers may not always be US Persons, so missions should make every attempt to not include export-controlled information in the proposal. If it necessary to include export-controlled information in the proposal, the mission should clearly mark the proposal with the appropriate Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) category markings and provide a version of the proposal with all export-controlled information removed.

Instructions for the Science and Applications Section: The science section should address four major topics: science merit, data products, applied and operational uses, and programmatic elements.

Science Merit: Describe how the additional years of data collection will enhance the science merits of your mission datasets and the specific contributions of the instruments within your mission. Describe the science objectives for the next 3 years, specifying changes, if any, from current science objectives. Summarize the accomplishments of the past three years and describe the mission's plans for the next 3 years. Explain how the continuation of the mission datasets and the proposed science program contribute to the ESD's Earth Science to Action Strategy and advances Administration priorities, including any new scientific knowledge that will be enabled by the extension, and the uniqueness or irreplaceability of the data among global observations.

Data Products: Describe how the mission will maintain/manage the standard data products during the extension, including discussion of any current or predicted instrument or spacecraft performance degradations that affect the quality of those products. Discuss the history/trend of product quality over the life of the mission, with attention to the three years since the last Senior Review. Resources required for routine calibration,

[1] See for example: https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/missions/operating. Reports from the prior (2005-2023) Senior Reviews are currently available on this site.

validation, and algorithm maintenance to maintain the quality of these data products should be included. The proposal narrative should focus on the work that is being performed by the core DA science team. A list of standard data products, highlighting changes since the last Senior Review (if applicable), should be included in the presentation backup. This list must include a table, or otherwise indicate which standard products are developed/maintained by the core DA science team, or by a separately funded science team.

For standard data products that rely on data from missions or instruments outside of the proposing project's control, identify the required external resource. If all NASA parties in the shared data product are proposing in response to this letter, each mission should detail its own elements of the task along with the complementary support from the other mission(s).

Applied and Operational Uses: Describe the merits and specific contributions of the mission to applied and operational uses (i.e. non-research use). The proposal should convey the value of datasets for applications that serve national interests (operational uses, public services, military operations, etc). Clearly summarize what has been accomplished for applied and operational uses, including technical specifics and well-described examples and explain how the proposed mission extension contributes to the ESD Earth Science to Action Strategy.

Programmatic Elements: Briefly summarize the programmatic elements required for mission implementation, including the geographic and organizational locations of key mission elements (science management, project management, ground station, science data acquisition and distribution center, etc.), and the identification and roles of any international or inter-Agency partners. Also identify any parallel funding sources that are *required* for supporting any of the activities in these mission extension proposals, both for efforts already funded and for anticipated future funding.

Projects should consider providing an on-line bibliography of recent publications. The proposal should contain the URL/web address to this bibliography. Bibliographies included in the text of the proposal should be included in the backup.

Instructions for the Technical Section: This section should address two major topics: technical status and plans and innovative measures proposed or implemented to increase efficiency and reduce costs in the aggregate during the extension period.

Discuss the overall technical status of the elements of the mission, and the team's approach to managing operations to optimize health and longevity of the elements. Include the spacecraft, instruments, and ground systems including spacecraft control center and science center(s). Summarize actions taken or planned to improve the effectiveness of the mission operations tasks and describe what improvements/efficiencies have been accomplished or are planned and any resulting cost reductions in aggregate during the extension period. Summarize the health of the elements and point out limitations as a result of degradation, aging, use of consumables, obsolescence, failures, orbit changes, etc. Hosted instruments, especially those on the International Space Station, should address accommodation issues such as cleanliness or duty cycles, that may affect the dataset. Include an estimate and rationale of mission life expectancy, including life-limiting items, an estimate of post-mission lifetime (assuming the initial 3-year extension), and an updated estimate of the reliability to accomplish your planned end-of-mission passivation procedure (also assuming the 3-year extension). Provide supporting data in the form of engineering data tables and figures in the backup.

Instructions for the Budget Section: This section should include the budget narrative described below.

The budgets that will be submitted in the parallel Program Planning & Budget Execution (PPBE) 2028 process must be fully consistent with those proposed in the Senior Review.

Each mission must submit an in-guideline proposal. For missions which choose to submit an optimal/over-guideline scenario, a second over-guideline total budget submittal is also required. The budget narrative must clearly describe the additional scope, and the science narrative must be equally clear regarding the benefits provided through both the in-guide and over-guide funding, and the difference between the two scenarios.

- In-Guideline Scenario: Describe a scenario that does not exceed the baseline allocation provided in the Guideline Mission Spreadsheets provided by the Senior Review Program Officer. If the Project believes that the guideline is sufficient to support a viable mission, but not the present set of products and activities, the project should identify the set of activities and products that will be supported, those that will not, and the impacts of any adjustments in work content on the science return for the mission. Decommissioning an instrument early (i.e. before the end of the approved operational period) to carry over Phase E funds to complete Phase F activities is an acceptable scenario.

- Optimal Scenario: You may describe a funding level that leads to an executable mission, a more effective or efficient mission, improves data continuity/quality, or enables new science for marginal costs, while still recognizing the tight fiscal constraints placed on the combined Program of Record and future Decadal Survey missions. The technical/science description of this scenario should clearly define the discrete items or activities mapped to the WBS (see Attachment A) and expected benefits compared to an in-guideline scenario.

Labor, major equipment and other expenses must be explained in sufficient detail to determine the incremental cost of each proposed task. The budget must include all project-specific costs including mission services performed at GSFC by the ESMO Project, at JPL, by NASA's networks such as the Ground Network (GN), the Space Network (SN), or the NASA Communications Network.

Summarize anticipated 'in kind' support from NASA-funded sources other than the project's MO&DA budget. These 'in kind' sources include but are not limited to: processing of mission data to generate core data products by the ESDS Program; satellite tracking support from NASA networks; and support from the multi-mission infrastructure projects at GSFC, JPL, and elsewhere. Supporting or in-kind sources that should NOT be included in the budget tables: algorithm development activities funded through ROSES; airborne science infrastructure; supporting activities from non-NASA sources such an international partners, or other US Government agencies. However, the extent of the partners' participation should be identified in the narrative.

Attachment A to this letter contains the Work Breakdown Structure and definitions for "MO" and "DA." Attachment B contains instructions and the mandatory form for the budget portion of each. Attachment C contains the additional template to be used as a supplement to the budget narrative. This is requested for one year at minimum, but additional years are requested if details or budgets vary significantly from FY2027.

Civil service labor is included in the budget allocations.

Required in Backup:

Mission Data Product Inventory. Include a brief summary description of the data product; the approximate time duration of the data record; the instrument(s) required to produce the product; the maturity of the algorithm(s) required to produce the product; the primary NASA and/or applied and operational users (including contact information such as phone or e-mail addresses, if known); and the availability and location of the product for community use and access. The inventory must include a summary table that contains at minimum the following columns: Data Product Name, Data Product Description, and Algorithm Source (ROSES or Mission DA). Sample data product tables will be provided at the Senior Review Library (see "Further Information" below).

Mission budget in specified format. Attachment B describes the mandatory formats for your budget request and supplies spreadsheet templates. The additional budget content format from Attachment C may be submitted here, although the preferred location is part of the budget narrative in the body of the presentation. Supplementary, detailed cost information to assist the cost evaluation is encouraged and should be included in the backup.

Acronym list

Technical data (e.g. engineering data, consumables and predicted utilization, performance degradation) to support the spacecraft and/or instrument projected performance and life expectancy.

Proposal Submission:
Proposals must be endorsed by the Program Office before being submitted electronically in PowerPoint format to the Senior Review Program Officer. The budget spreadsheets should be incorporated into the PowerPoint presentation and also submitted in Excel format (XLS or XLSX) to the Senior Review Program Officer. All proposal content must be received by COB on March 27, 2026.

Additional Documentation:

National Interests Proposal Supplement
Each mission must submit a one-page supplement/mission "fact sheet" in Microsoft Word format briefly summarizing the mission and data products. Please also include a brief summary of known operational users and applications of the mission data including in the private sector. The National Interests Proposal Supplement should be submitted via email to the Senior Review Program Officer by COB on February 13, 2025.

Updated End of Mission Plan
Per NPR 8715.6B an End of Mission Plan update must be submitted to the Office of Safety and Mission Assurance for review **at least 30 days** prior to a mission extension decision. If the last approved End of Mission Plan does not fully cover the period of the proposed extension (FY27-FY29), an update must be submitted at the same time as the Senior Review Proposal. If required, the updated End of Mission Plan may be submitted via email to the Senior Review Program Officer by COB on March 27, 2025.

Further Information
Proposers may have requests for clarification on any of the items contained in this letter. For further information, contact the Senior Review Program Officer, Jamie Wicks, jamie.wilson.wicks@nasa.gov, or at the address below. The ESD will review all requests for information and if additional updates are sent out they will be shared with all proposers. It is the sole discretion of the ESD to determine which, if any, clarifications are required.

Jamie Wilson Wicks
Earth Science Division
Science Mission Directorate
NASA Headquarters
Washington DC 20546-0001
Telephone: (202) 358-4649

Three attachments:

A. Definitions of the Work Breakdown Structure for NASA Science Operating Flight Missions
B. MS Excel spreadsheet: ESD Senior Review FY27-FY29_Spreadsheet.xls
C. Supplemental Budget Narrative Template

Attachment A: Definitions of Work Breakdown Structure for NASA Science Operating Missions

The WBS elements are intended for flight projects in all phases of implementation, from pre-Phase A through mission termination and disposal. The Projects should use the WBS dictionary for guidance on how to break out their proposed costs, but as general suggestion for missions in operations, and in particular in extended operations beyond the primary mission phase, only a subset of the standard WBS elements are expected to show any activity. Among the eleven Level 2 WBS categories, active elements for our missions would reasonably be:

1.0	Project Management
4.0	Science/Data Analysis
7.0	Mission operations
9.0	Ground systems

Management of the mission elements could be accounted for in either Project Management (1.0) or Science (4.0), with the projects defining the appropriate distribution in their proposals. Any efforts related to Systems Engineering (2.0), Safety and Mission Assurance (3.0), Payload (5.0) and Spacecraft (6.0) could reasonably be folded into Mission Operations (7.0) for extended missions. Launch vehicles (8.0) and Systems Integration and Testing (10.0) are no longer applicable. Education and Public Outreach (11.0) should not be used.

Additional work element definitions:
"Data Analysis" encompasses the work scope defined in Element 4 above, and specific project-funded data processing of Level 1 and above products. Activities typically included in "Data Analysis" are: customized data processing, analysis activities, documentation, presentation and publication of scientific results, science events planning, instrument and observation performance analysis, science data calibration, validation and certification of processed data, science operations centers, etc.

"Mission Operations" encompasses the work scope defined in Element 7 above, data acquisition and processing through Level 0 only. Activities typically included in "Mission Operations" are: command generation and telemetry monitoring; health and performance monitoring of the spacecraft, instruments, and ground system; mission analysis and planning/scheduling; spacecraft resource (power, etc.) constraints analysis; trajectory, orbit, attitude planning and determination, etc.

"Competed Science" or "Competed Data Analysis" encompasses investigations solicited through ROSES.

Attachment B:
Budget Template

Instructions for the Budget Spreadsheet

General Guidelines

Show all costs in Real-Year K DOLLARS.

For those missions with budgeted activities at more than one NASA center provide the full cost budget for each Center in both Table I (Budget by Cost Elements/labor, travel and procurements) and Table II (Budget by WBS).

The approved budgets are for the entire year shown, if the prime mission ends in the middle of a fiscal year, show the total budget for that year, covering both prime and extended operations.

The budget totals (all Centers) for the Budget Tables I, II, and III should match, and should equal the top-level approved budget provided on the $K template.

Note: Budget totals and breakouts by MO /DA must be consistent with PPBE submission.

Table I **FY27 - 29 Approved Budget by Cost Element by Center**

Separate entries should be made for each supporting Center.

Table II **FY27- FY29 Approved Budget By WBS By Center**

Describe how your project's budget breaks down by function

The rows in Tables II correspond to the WBS definitions shown in Attachment A to the Call for Proposals.

Separate entries should be made for each supporting Center.

- Only Civil Servants should be entered under FTE line
- WYEs Onsite include all NASA center on-site/near site contractor workforce.
- **WYEs Offsite include any NASA far offsite workforce and/or remote non NASA workforce (i.e. TSIS-1 @ LASP , etc.)**

Note: WBS 11/EPO has been deleted

Table III **FY27- FY29 Approved Budget by Instrument Team**

Table III is required only for Aqua and Aura. Other missions should leave this table blank.

Describe how your budget breaks down by the instrument teams.
"Other Science teams" may apply to cross instrument science teams and efforts.
"Other expenses" may apply to shared services such as mission operations, E/PO, Cal/Val, etc..

Table IV **FY27 - FY29 FTE Template**

Fill in FTEs or WYEs as appropriate.

- Only Civil Servants should be entered under FTE line
- WYEs Onsite include all NASA center on-site/near site contractor workforce.
- **WYEs Offsite include any NASA far offsite workforce and/or remote non NASA workforce (i.e. TSIS-1 @ LASP, etc.)**

Table V **Supplemental Budget Narrative FY27 (or additional years if details or budget requests vary significantly from FY27)**

Workforce (the mission may itemize by center, but not required).

Note: this sheet has **4** workforce categories, NASA CS FTEs, JPL WYEs, WYEs and Other WYEs.
The previous workforce definitions still apply, **in this sheet the JPL WYEs should be shown on their own line.**
WYE= Near or On Site
Other WYEs: Offiste work such as SORCEat LASP etc.

Budget : The mission may itemize by center, but not required.
C.S. Labor: Consider itemizing by Center, Instrument, etc.
Travel: Consider itemizing by type, e.g. Conference, Science Team Meetings, Program meetings, etc. Includes C.S. travel only summarize as you choose.
Contracts: List each contract, company/institution, work scope, include fully loaded labor, travel & materials/other purchases
Grants: List each university, work scope, annual cost
Materials and other Purchases: Summary estimate, group as appropriate-include items directly purchased-supplies etc (in other words, not through a contract.

BUDGET TEMPLATE

Project: **WBS:**

Point of Contact: Contact Information:

	FY27	FY28	FY29
Budget			
Total Budget Input:	$ -	$ -	$ -
Delta: Submit to Approved:	$ -	$ -	$ -

Table I Approved Budget by Cost Element and Center

	FY27	FY28	FY29
GSFC			
1000 Labor			
2100 Travel			
3000 Procurements			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -
JPL			
1000 Labor			
2100 Travel			
3000 Procurements			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -
LARC			
1000 Labor			
2100 Travel			
3000 Procurements			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -
Other Center			
1000 Labor			
2100 Travel			
3000 Procurements			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -
Other Center			
1000 Labor			
2100 Travel			
3000 Procurements			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL - Includes all Applicable Centers/Organizations			
1000 Labor	$ -	$ -	$ -
2100 Travel	$ -	$ -	$ -
3000 Procurements	$ -	$ -	$ -
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -

Table II Approved Budget by WBS and Center

	FY27			FY28			FY29		
GSFC	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science									
Science (other than labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
7.0 Mission Operations									
Mission Ops (other than Labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
Total*	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
JPL	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science									
Science (other than labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
7.0 Mission Operations									
Mission Ops (other than Labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
Total*	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
LARC	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science									
Science (other than labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
7.0 Mission Operations									
Mission Ops (other than Labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
Total*	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
(Other Center-List)	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science									
Science (other than labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
7.0 Mission Operations									
Mission Ops (other than Labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
Total*	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
(Other Center-List)	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science									
Science (other than labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
7.0 Mission Operations									
Mission Ops (other than Labor)									
FTE Labor									
WYE Onsite Labor									
WYE Offsite Labor									
Total*	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
TOTAL - Includes all applicable Centers/Organizations									
	$K	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**	**$K**	**FTE**	**WYE**
4.0 Science	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
Science (other than labor)	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
FTE Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
WYE Onsite Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
WYE Offsite Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
7.0 Mission Operations	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
Mission Ops(other than La	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
FTE Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
WYE Onsite Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
WYE Offsite Labor	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0	$0.0	0	0
Total*	**$0.0**	**0**	**0**	**$0.0**	**0**	**0**	**$0.0**	**0**	**0**

* Totals for Table II should be equal to the year by year totals in Table I.

Table III Approved Budget by Instrument Team Aqua and Aura ONLY

	FY27	FY28	FY29
1. Instrument A			
2. Instrument B			
3. Instrument C			
all instrument teams)			
Other science teams			
Other mission expenses			
Total*	$ -	$ -	$ -

FTE / WYE TEMPLATE

Project: **WBS:**

Point of Contact:

All entries in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) for Civil Servants, or Work Year Equivalents (WYE) for Contractors

Table IV Workforce by Center

		FY27	FY28	FY29
Center:	**GSFC**			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total*	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Center:	**JPL**			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs			
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs			
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total*	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Center:	**LARC**			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total*	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Center:	**Other**			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total*	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Center:	**Other**			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total*	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	TOTAL - Includes all applicable Centers/Organizations			
	4.0 Science	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	7.0 Mission Operations	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	Civil Service FTEs	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs On/Near Site	0.0	0.0	0.0
	WYEs-- Offsite	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Total Workforce	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**

Attachment C. Supplemental Budget Narrative Table

The following table should be incorporated into the budget narrative but may be submitted as part of the Budget section in the presentation backup. This table should cover FY2027 at minimum, but additional years if details or budget requests vary significantly from FY2027, and its main purpose is to associate workforce and non-labor cost elements (e.g. travel, subcontracts, material) with the products/deliverables and activity/task being performed.

Supplemental Budget Narrative Table FY27 (or additional years if details vary significantly from FY27)
$K

Workforce (the mission may itemize by center, but not required).
Note: this sheet has **4** workforce categories, NASA CS FTEs, JPL WYEs, WYEs and Other WYEs.
The previous workforce definitions still apply, **in this sheet the JPL WYEs should be shown on their own line.**
WYE= Near or On Site
Other WYEs: Offsite contract workforce (such as LASP workforce for SORCE, U.Texas for GRACE)
FTEs and WYEs only – FTEs and WYES in Tables II, IV and V should match

Budget: The mission may itemize by center, but not required.
C.S. Labor cost: Consider itemizing by Center, Instrument, etc.
Travel: Consider itemizing by type, e.g. Conference, Science Team Meetings, Program meetings, etc. Includes C.S. travel only summarize as you choose.
Contracts: List each contract, company/institution, work scope, include fully loaded labor, travel & materials/other purchases
Grants: List each university, work scope, annual cost
Materials and other Purchases: Summary estimate, group as appropriate-include items directly purchased-supplies etc (in other words, not through a contrac

Input Project Name /WBS Here	FY27 (or additional years if details vary significantly from FY27)				
	NASA Civil Service FTE	NASA JPL WYE	WYE (on/near-site)	Other WYE (offsite)	Total FY27
WORKFORCE					
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Science WBS element 4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
Mission Operations WBS element 7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0
					0.0

	Civil Servant Labor Cost	Civil Servant Travel Cost	Procurement $			Total FY27
			Labor	Other Travel	Material/ Other Purchases	
Budget						XXXX
TOTAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT ($K)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
WBS 4.0/Science	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
WBS 7.0/Mission Operations	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0