

Conversion: Allowed
Priority: normal
Disclose-Recipients: Prohibited
Alternate-Recipient: Allowed
Date: 05 Sep 1997 18:12:55 -0700
From: Larry N Dumas <Larry.N.Dumas@jpl.nasa.gov>
To: rex@smad.com (IPM Return requested),
Saterios S Dallas <Saterios.S.Dallas@jpl.nasa.gov> (IPM Return requested)
Subject: Your Request
MIME-Version: 1.0

Sam and Rex, you asked for some advice, so here it is. I have chatted with Mous Chahine and briefly with Ed, and here's my take. There is no precedent that anyone can think of for the Laboratory, at the Director's level, taking an institutional position on appropriate recognition for an individual for the purpose of "setting history straight". From my point of view, it would be an unfortunate precedent to set, because it would put Laboratory management in the position of passing judgement in areas best left to peers.

There are a couple of formal review processes already in place to facilitate appropriate recognition. NASA honors and awards undergo a review process overseen by Kirk Dawson, and issues of ethics in research are subjected to a peer review process overseen by Mous Chahine. Mous did not feel that this rather complex issue was a good candidate for formal ethics review. He did note that the usual way to see that appropriate recognition is given is through the peer reviewed publications process, and he recommended that an overview paper published in a respected journal would be the best way to go about it. As to a NASA (or JPL) award, the regular process provides that anyone can submit a candidate. There is no penalty for resubmitting previously unsuccessful nominees, and in fact this is often done, so this option is available to you if you choose to use it.

This is perhaps not what you were hoping for, but I really don't think we ought to put the Director in the awkward position of trying to arbitrate a dispute of this sort.

Regards,
Larry