

August 11, 2004

EA-04-026

Mr. William Hungerford
CCB Representative for the AMS Collaboration
12414 Timber Hollow
Houston, TX 77058

Dear Mr. Hungerford:

Congratulations on your recent assignment as Professor Ting's and the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer (AMS) Collaboration's Representative to the NASA AMS Project Office Configuration Control Board (CCB). I am positive this will be rewarding for both groups and look forward to your contribution.

As stated during the July 2004 AMS TIM, the new NASA AMS Project Office is attempting to clearly define the Payload's "Road to CoFR," including this classic "Material Review Board (MRB)" authority to disposition flight hardware manufacturing, integration, and assembly discrepancies.

The AMS Project Office (APO) recognizes that the AMS Collaboration is responsible for all Quality Assurance functions with respect to the AMS Experiment. The APO maintains responsibility for Flight and Ground Safety and manages the interfaces between the Experiment and the Payload Integration Hardware (PIH), the interfaces between the Payload and the Shuttle, and the interfaces between the Payload and the International Space Station. As a part of our responsibilities for Safety and Integration it is important for NASA to maintain insight into fabrication and assembly issues as the experiment hardware is built. During internal discussions at JSC, the following questions were raised:

1. How does the AMS Collaboration conduct nonconformance reporting and tracking?
2. Who in the Collaboration has the overall responsibility for approving dispositions to nonconformance issues?
3. What level of nonconformance reporting and tracking by the Collaboration will allow the CCB adequate insight into nonconformance issues with the experiment hardware?
4. What process will the Collaboration use to bring nonconformance issues that result in a Type I Change (issues that affect either Safety or Experiment Interfaces to the PIH) to the CCB for review and approval?

5. What configuration identification (labeling) requirements will the Collaboration impose on all controlled hardware, software and firmware?

Would you discuss these questions with the appropriate individuals within the Collaboration and provide us with consensus answers? As you know, these activities are governed at JSC by an MRB as described in Work Instruction NT-CWI-003, Quality Assurance Records Center Discrepancy Reporting and Tracking. Ultimately the intent of this letter is to determine who has MRB authority within the AMS Collaboration and who is responsible for configuration control.

Cordially,

Original signed by:

Stephen V. Porter
NASA AMS Project Manager