Source Selection Statement
United States Deorbit Vehicle
Solicitation 80JSC023R0003
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

On June 3, 2024, I met with members of the United States Deorbit Vehicle (USDV) Contract Source Evaluation Board (SEB or Board) and spoke with them about the final evaluation results for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) USDV procurement, under Request for Proposals (RFP or solicitation) 80JSC023R0003, dated September 18, 2023. This briefing was made to me in my capacity as the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this procurement. Prior to the briefing, the Board provided me with its final evaluation findings to review, which I did before attending the briefing. In addition to myself, the briefing was attended by members of the Board and key management officials. During the briefing, the Board reported its final evaluation results and I provided the Board with my independent judgment relative to the final evaluation results and asked several questions regarding the information presented. This award decision results from the information presented in the Board evaluation and briefing.

BACKGROUND

The USDV contract will provide NASA with a safe, reliable, and cost-effective deorbit vehicle to meet NASA's International Space Station (ISS) end-of-life deorbit mission requirements. This will require the Contractor to design, develop, manufacture, test, integrate, achieve NASA acceptance, deliver, and sustain its USDV such that the vehicle can perform the final deorbit of the ISS. The USDV will rendezvous and dock with the ISS as well as perform ISS attitude control, ISS translational maneuvers, and the final ISS orbit shaping and reentry burns.

This competitive acquisition will result in a Single Award as either Hybrid Cost Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF) and Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract or a 100% FFP contract. To maximize value to the Government, the USDV RFP allowed Offerors flexibility in proposing a contract type for Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) 1 and for CLIN 2 to best suit each Offeror's solution. From a Cost/Price standpoint, the solicitation describes an evaluation approach that supports a meaningful comparison and discrimination between and among the competing proposals, providing sufficient information to allow Offerors to compete intelligently and on equal terms. The RFP includes a clear description of NASA's minimum needs, requests data that allows consideration of the cost to the Government, and appropriately details a method to compare the relative costs of proposals to reasonably establish which proposal would be more or less costly to NASA. The solicitation notified Offerors how the proposal evaluations would be conducted on an equal basis, to provide all Offerors with a common basis for the preparation of their proposals.

Offerors have the ability to propose one of the following CLIN structures, consisting of CPIF and/or FFP contract types:

Hybrid CPIF and FFP core with Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) FFP task orders. (Applicable if proposing CPIF CLIN 1 and FFP CLIN 2)

OR

FFP core with IDIQ FFP task orders. (Applicable if proposing FFP CLIN 1 and FFP CLIN 2)

OR

Hybrid CPIF core with IDIQ FFP task orders. (Applicable if proposing CPIF CLIN 1 and CPIF CLIN 2)

Regardless of which CLIN structure each Offeror choses to propose, the solicitation requires compliance with FAR 52.215-21, *Requirements for Certified Cost or Pricing Data and Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data-Modifications*. Any of the three CLIN structures were available for Offerors to propose without prejudicing evaluation of each proposal.

The awarded contract will have two completion form CLINS, plus an IDIQ portion inclusive of CLINS 3, 4, and 5. The period of performance of this acquisition includes a completion form core (inclusive of CLINs 1 and 2) through the Desired (August 1, 2028) or Required (May 1, 2029) Delivery Date, as proposed by the Offeror, plus IDIQ ordering period of up to 11 years and 3 months from the contract effective date, consisting of a 6-year 9-month base period and five option periods. Included in the solicitation is contract clause FAR 52.216-22, *Indefinite-Quantity*, that will allow for task orders to be completed within two years after the end of the ordering period. For the Indefinite-Quantity portions of this acquisition, the contract guaranteed minimum amount to be ordered under this contract is $100,000 and the contract Not to Exceed (NTE) amount which may be ordered under this contract is $302,000,000.

Offerors were further given the ability to propose either the Government's desired delivery date of August 1, 2028, or required delivery date of May 1, 2029, without prejudicing evaluation of each proposal.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

Request for Information (RFI)/Sources Sought Synopsis (SSS)

On August 19, 2022, NASA issued a notice in the Federal System for Award Management (SAM) including an RFI/SSS to solicit capability statements from Industry through SAM.gov under notice ID 80JSC022ISSDeorbit. Comments and questions were due no later than September 9, 2022. On August 25, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 1 was published, extending the due date for responses to September 16, 2022. On September 29, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 2 was published, requesting additional information no later than October 14, 2022. On November 17, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 3 published, adding documents to the technical library and requesting additional information no later than December 21, 2022. November 28, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 4 was published

with a notification of industry day and one-on-one communications to occur on December 7-9, 2022.

On December 6, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 5 was published, providing additional information related to the December 7, 2022, Industry Day and adding documents to the technical library.

Industry Day

On December 7 to 9, 2022, NASA held Industry Day and conducted one-on-one meetings with interested parties for the USDV acquisition. On December 16, 2022, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 6 was published, providing the Industry Day Charts and Industry Day Questions and Answers. On March 24, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 7 was published to enable the Interested Vendors List within the posting to allow potential Offerors the opportunity to network.

On May 3, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 8 was published to notify industry of the upcoming Presolicitation Conference and one-on-one meetings to be held on May 9, 2023, and of additional documents that were posted to the technical library.

Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP)

May 4, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 9 published to post a draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) to solicit responses for interested parties, with comments and questions due May 31, 2023.

Presolicitation Conference

On May 4, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 10 was published to update the location of the May 9, 2023, Presolicitation Conference, and to add additional dates for one-on-ones on May 15-16, 2023. On May 8, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 11 was published to notify industry of availability of pre-solicitation conference charts. On May 9, 2023, the Presolicitation Conference and one-on-ones were held with industry. On May 12, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 12 published to extend the date for interested parties to request a one-on-one to May 15, 2023. Additional one-on-ones were held with industry on May 15-16, 2023. On May 24, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mod 13 was published to post Presolicitation and DRFP Questions and Answers and update the technical library.

On June 6, 2023, and July 28, 2023, notice 80JSC022ISSDeorbit Mods 14 and 15 were published to update the technical library and on September 13, 2023, the Pre-solicitation notice number 80JSC023R0003 published.

Request for Proposal (RFP)

On September 18, 2023, NASA released the USDV RFP and associated documents on SAM.gov. The RFP responses were initially due on November 17, 2023. This posting also included an announcement of a Virtual Pre-Proposal Conference, held on October 3, 2023. The following USDV RFP amendments were issued:

- Modification 1 – October 2, 2023: published to notify industry of the availability of the USDV Pre-Proposal Conference Charts.

- Modification 2 – October 6, 2023: published to notify industry of availability of final preproposal conference charts.
- Modification 3 – October 18, 2023: published with Amendment 1 to the solicitation.
- Modification 4 – October 20, 2023: published to notify industry of availability of the Pre-proposal Conference Questions and Answers and Final RFP Questions and Answers.
- Modification 5 – October 30, 2023: published to notify industry of Amendment 2 to the solicitation and technical library updates.
- Modification 6 – November 8, 2023: published to notify industry of Amendment 3 to the solicitation and Final RFP Questions and Answers. The proposal due date was extended to December 14, 2023.
- Modification 7 – December 5, 2023: published to notify industry of Amendment 4 to the solicitation, an updated cover letter, updated templates, and updated technical library. The proposal due date was extended to February 12, 2024.
- Modification 8 – December 15, 2023: published to notify industry of extension of the proposal due date to March 4, 2024, Amendment 5 to the solicitation, and updated templates.
- Modification 9 – January 22, 2024: published to notify industry of anticipated Amendment 6 to the solicitation and to publish Amendment 4 Questions and Answers.
- Modification 10 – January 25, 2024: published to notify industry of Amendment 6 to the solicitation and update associated templates.
- Modification 11 – January 30, 2024: published to notify industry of Amendment 7 to the solicitation.
- Modification 12 – February 29, 2024: published to notify industry of Questions and Answers Part IV.

Receipt of Proposals

On February 9, 2024, Past Performance Volumes were submitted by two companies (listed alphabetically): Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation (NG) and Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (SpaceX). The contracting officer (CO) performed an initial review of the Past Performance volumes received in accordance with RFP provision M.1, *Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award,* and NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Supplement (NFS) subsection 1815.305-70, *Identification of Unacceptable Proposals,* and found both proposals to be initially acceptable. The SEB evaluated Past Performance in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the USDV solicitation, the USDV Evaluation Plan, and the FAR and the NFS. The order of evaluation of the two Offerors was determined in accordance with the USDV Evaluation Plan. The Offerors' Past Performance proposals were evaluated in the following order:

1. SpaceX
2. NG

On the proposal due date of March 4, 2024, three proposals (including Mission Suitability and Cost/Price volumes) were received via NASA Enterprise File Sharing/Sync (EFSS) Box from the following companies (in alphabetical order): AlphaSpaces, NG, and SpaceX. The CO

performed an initial review of the proposals received in accordance with RFP provision M.1, *Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award*, and NFS subsection 1815.305-70, *Identification of Unacceptable Proposals.* Per NFS 1815.305-70(a)(1): "the contracting officer shall not complete the initial evaluation of any proposal when it is determined that the proposal is unacceptable because it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address the essential requirements of the RFP or clearly demonstrates that the offeror does not understand the requirements." The CO determined that NG's and SpaceX's proposals were initially acceptable. However, AlphaSpaces' proposal was determined to be unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70 and no further evaluation of this proposal was conducted. AlphaSpaces was timely notified of this decision and did not challenge it.

The SEB evaluated the remaining proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the USDV solicitation, the USDV Evaluation Plan, the FAR, and the NFS. The evaluation criteria are further described under the *Evaluation Process and Criteria* section below. The order of evaluation of the remaining Offerors proposals was determined in accordance with the USDV Evaluation Plan. The Offerors' Mission Suitability and Cost/Price proposals were evaluated in the following order:

1. SpaceX
2. NG

Competitive Range Determination

On April 19, 2024, the results of the Board's initial evaluation of proposals were presented to me, the SSA, and to the senior NASA officials in attendance. This presentation included detailed evaluation results for each proposal, including Cost/Price, Mission Suitability, and Past Performance. I thoroughly discussed with the SEB the associated value and risks related to each of the proposals. Based on my analysis and those discussions, I concurred with the CO's determination that it was in the Government's best interest to establish a competitive range consisting of the highest rated Offerors; SpaceX and NG (listed in the order of evaluation).

Discussions

On April 24, 2024, NASA opened discussions with SpaceX and NG. The Offerors were notified of their inclusion in the competitive range and were provided

1. Model Contract Issues and Updates,
2. Cost/Price Issues and Questions,
3. Adverse Mission Suitability Findings,
4. Mission Suitability Questions,
5. Past Performance Feedback,
6. Responsibility Questions, and
7. An Agenda for Oral Discussions.

Offerors were instructed to provide written responses to these items no later than April 30, 2024.

Both Offerors provided timely written responses that were reviewed by the SEB voting members. After reviewing the information provided, the Board held discussions with NG on May 6, 2024, and with SpaceX on May 7, 2024.

On May 9, 2024, NASA closed discussions with both SpaceX and NG, providing both Offerors with an Amendment 8 to the solicitation and a request for Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs). FPRs were due no later than 1:30 p.m. CDT on May 14, 2024.

Receipt of FPRs

FPRs from both Offerors were received by the due date of May 14, 2024. Both proposals were received prior to the proposal deadline. FPRs were evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the USDV solicitation, the USDV Evaluation Plan, the FAR, and the NFS.

Presentation of Final Evaluation Results to the SSA

On June 3, 2024, the SEB presented its final evaluation results briefing (covering FPRs) to the SSA.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The proposals were evaluated in strict accordance with the *Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15, NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815,* and the USDV RFP. The RFP details the SEB Evaluation instructions, factors, and criteria contained in Sections L and M of the RFP.

As detailed above, upon receipt of the proposals, the SEB conducted an initial review of the proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with *NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals.*

The remaining two proposals were then evaluated by the SEB. Subfactors were evaluated in accordance with *NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A).* The SEB carried out the evaluation activities, documented its findings, and then reported its findings to the SSA, who is responsible for making the final source selection decision.

The USDV RFP stated that the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. As detailed in the RFP, this procurement is being conducted utilizing a combination of Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award. Likewise, the highest technically rated proposal(s) may not necessarily receive an award. The evaluation factors were weighed in accordance with the criterion in the RFP's Section M:

- The Price factor is approximately equal to the combined importance of the Mission Suitability factor and Past Performance factor.

- As individual factors, Mission Suitability factor is more important than Past Performance factor.

COST / PRICE FACTOR

To evaluate proposals for a Single Award that may be either a CPIF and FFP contract or a 100% FFP contract, the RFP required the Offerors to submit specific data. While each Offeror had flexibility to propose a contract type for CLIN 1 and for CLIN 2, the evaluation was structured to provide the SSA with a meaningful comparison that allows consideration of the cost to the Government and a common basis for the preparation of the Offerors' proposals.

Solicitation provision M.2, Cost and Price Factor (Volume II), states that, "for the purposes of source selection, the total evaluated price (TEP) for all proposals will be the summation of the USDV CLINs (delineated below), Government Task Agreements (GTAs), and Government provided (Furnished Property, Facilities, & Data/Information) for the contract period of performance (core and options):

a. CLIN 1 - DDT&E through CDR (CPIF or FFP, depending on Offerors proposed contract type) Core Contract by GFY
b. CLIN 2 - Production, Assembly, Integration, and Test (CPIF or FFP, depending on Offerors proposed contract type) Core Contract by GFY
c. CLIN 2A - Option (CPIF or FFP, depending on Offerors proposed contract type) Core Contract by GFY
d. CLIN 3 - Dwell (FFP) IDIQ, Average GFY 2028-2035 x 2yrs
e. CLIN 4 - Launch Vehicle Integration and Sustaining (FFP) IDIQ by GFY; Pre-Priced Task Order (TO) 1, Based on CLIN 4 IDIQ by GFY
f. CLIN 5 - Special Task & Studies
    - Sub-CLIN 5A Special Studies (FFP) IDIQ by GFY
    - Sub-CLIN 5B Evaluation Requirements (FFP) IDIQ by GFY
g. Government Task Agreements (GTA)
h. Government Provided (Furnished Property, Facilities, & Data/Information)"

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's proposed Total Evaluated Cost and/or Price. The Government performed the cost and/or price evaluation in accordance with the USDV Evaluation Plan, solicitation provision M.2, FAR 15.305 - *Proposal Evaluation*, FAR 15.404 - *Proposal Analysis*, and NFS 1815.305 - *Proposal Evaluation* appropriately depending on the CLIN structure proposed by the Offeror. The USDV CLIN structure (e.g., CLIN 1, either CPIF or FFP; CLIN 2, either CPIF or FFP, CLIN 3-5 FFP) determined the proposal analysis techniques that were performed to ensure that the final agreed-to price is fair and reasonable in accordance with FAR 15.404-1 and allow the competition to be conducted on an equal and common basis. To conduct a meaningful comparison in this competition on an equal and common basis, the proposed TEP and the results of the Government's analysis were presented to the SSA for consideration in making a source selection decision.

For proposals utilizing CPIF for CLIN 1, CLIN 2, or CLIN 2A, the Government performed a cost realism analysis on each proposal's applicable CLIN 1, CLIN 2, or CLIN 2A to evaluate the realism and reasonableness of the proposed costs in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d). The cost realism analysis was used to determine the most probable cost to the Government for each proposal including ensuring proposal costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's proposal. The Government did not make any adjustments to fee for any probable cost adjustments.

For proposals utilizing FFP for CLIN 1, CLIN 2, or CLIN 2A, the Government performed price analysis on each proposal's applicable CLIN 1, CLIN 2, or CLIN 2A. The Government did not make any adjustments to the proposed FFP.

For FFP CLINs 3-5, the Government performed price analysis on CLINs 3-5, regardless of Offerors decision to propose CPIF or FFP for CLIN 1, CLIN2, or CLIN 2A. The Government did not make any adjustments to the FFP CLINs 3-5 proposed price in Attachment L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D.

MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's proposal in accordance with solicitation provision M.3, *Mission Suitability (Volume II)*, which reflects that Mission Suitability factor is comprised of three subfactors, weighted as follows, for a total of 1,000 points:

SUBFACTOR	**WEIGHT**
Technical Approach	650 points
Management Approach	200 points
Small Business Utilization	150 points
TOTAL	1000 points

In accordance with the USDV Evaluation Plan and the evaluation criteria for each set forth in provision M.3 for each subfactor, the SEB carefully reviewed each Offeror's proposal, identifying as applicable: Significant Strengths, Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, and Deficiencies, as documented in its findings. The SEB voting members collectively developed a consensus adjectival rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3) for each of the subfactors based on the identified Significant Strengths, Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, and/or Deficiencies.

Following the assignment of a consensus adjectival rating for each Offeror's proposal under each Mission Suitability subfactor, the SEB voting members collectively developed a consensus percentile rating that corresponded with the assigned adjectival rating. Once the percentile rating was established, the numerical score for that subfactor was computed by taking the consensus percentile rating for that subfactor and multiplying it by the maximum points available for that subfactor (weight). This represented the numerical score for a given subfactor. The final point value for the Mission Suitability factor was then calculated as the sum of the three subfactors'

point values. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process. Note, in accordance with the NFS, while the Offerors' proposals received an overall point score for the Mission Suitability factor, they did not receive an overall Mission Suitability adjectival rating.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's Past Performance volume in accordance with the USDV Evaluation Plan and the evaluation criteria set forth in solicitation provision M.4, Past Performance Evaluation (Volume III). The SEB carefully reviewed each Offeror's Past Performance for recency, relevance, and performance when determining a Past Performance Level of Confidence rating for each Offeror. More recent and more relevant past performance received greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent or less relevant past performance. A Level of Confidence rating was assessed at the overall factor level for Past Performance after evaluating aspects of each Offeror's recent and relevant past performance.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's proposal that was determined to be acceptable in response to the USDV Request for FPRs. In making my decision, I reviewed the proposal evaluations in their entirety and considered the Cost/Price results, Mission Suitability scores/ratings, and Past Performance Level of Confidence ratings. I also considered the content of the SEB's findings. My determination is based on the evaluation criteria specified in the Solicitation and is detailed below.

The following table depicts a summary of the evaluation results for each Offeror's FPR against the USDV's evaluation factors for award. Offerors are listed in the order of evaluation.

FACTOR	**SPACEX**	**NG**
COST/PRICE	$680M	Higher than $680M
MISSION SUITABILITY	822	589
PAST PERFORMANCE	Very High	Moderate

Offeror 1 – SpaceX

Price

SpaceX's TEP was $680M. SpaceX's proposal was evaluated for its proposed Total Evaluated Cost and/or Price. The Government performed the price evaluation in accordance with FAR 15.305 - Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 - Proposal Analysis, and NFS 1815.305 - Proposal Evaluation. The USDV CLIN structure (e.g., CLIN 1, either CPIF or FFP; CLIN 2, either CPIF

or FFP; CLIN 3-5 FFP) determined the proposal analysis techniques that were performed to ensure that the final agreed-to price is fair and reasonable in accordance with FAR 15.404-1.

SpaceX elected to submit a 100% FFP proposal in response to the Solicitation. Under the Cost/Price factor, other than certified cost or pricing data is required. The SEB conducted a price analysis on SpaceX's proposed Total Evaluated Cost and Price to ensure the final agreed-to price is fair and reasonable in accordance with USDV RFP section M.2. The Government's price analysis determined SpaceX's price to be fair and reasonable based on a comparison of proposed prices received in response to the USDV Solicitation, as well as compared to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE). The CO determined that adequate competition was present based on two responsible/responsive Offerors, competing independently, submitted prices satisfying the Government's expressed requirement and the finding was that the proposed prices were reasonable.

NASA used one or more of the various price analysis techniques and procedures found at FAR 15.404-1(b) to ensure a fair and reasonable total evaluated price determination and allow the competition to be conducted on an equal and common basis. SpaceX proposed FFP for CLIN 1, CLIN 2, and CLIN 2A, therefore, the SEB performed its price analysis on CLIN 1, CLIN 2, and CLIN 2A. The Board did not make any adjustments to SpaceX's proposed FFP for CLINS 1, 2, and 2A. For FFP CLINs 3-5, the SEB performed price analysis on CLINs 3-5, regardless of an Offeror's decision to propose CPIF or FFP for CLIN 1, CLIN 2, or CLIN 2A. NASA did not make cost/price adjustments to the FFP CLINs 3-5 proposed price. The Government's cost and price analysis determined SpaceX's price to be fair and reasonable based on a comparison of proposed prices received in response to the USDV solicitation, as well as compared to the Government's Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE). The CO determined that adequate competition was present based on two responsible/responsive Offerors, competing independently, submitting prices satisfying the Government's expressed requirement and there was no finding that the prices were unreasonable.

Mission Suitability

The SEB evaluated SpaceX's Mission Suitability (Volume II) proposal in accordance with the criteria defined in provisions L.27 and M.3 of the RFP. SpaceX's proposal received an overall score of 822 out of 1,000 points for the Mission Suitability factor. The SEB identified a total of three Significant Strengths, five Strengths and one Weakness. No Significant Weaknesses or Deficiencies were identified. Below is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of SpaceX's proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors:

Mission Suitability Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach (TA):

The SEB evaluated SpaceX's overall TA subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified three Significant Strengths, two Strengths, and one Weakness resulting in a rating of Excellent as explained in detail below. There were no Significant Weaknesses or Deficiencies identified.

The first Significant Strength is for an effective, feasible, and reasonable approach utilizing flight-proven hardware and software designs, including the reuse of a flight-proven vehicle and incorporation of flight-proven component designs in a newly designed vehicle section. SpaceX's approach considerably increases the likelihood of producing a highly reliable USDV, minimizes new development and testing, and reduces the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV and greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. The second Significant Strength is for a reasonable and effective approach to ensuring safety and mission assurance (SMA) products and requirements influence all aspects of USDV design and operations. This proposed approach effectively integrates the full suite of USDV system requirements, enabling SpaceX to converge on design and operation solutions that considerably increase the likelihood of producing a highly reliable USDV within the required schedule and greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. The third Significant Strength is for a reasonable, effective, and feasible Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation (DDT&E) approach that utilizes in-house design, build, and test; agile, rapid design iterations; and specialized reviews. SpaceX's proposed approach mitigates the technical risk and reduces the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV through early identification of technical issues, which appreciably enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

The first Strength is for a reasonable and feasible approach to the CLIN 2 (Statement of Work (SOW) Section 4.0 Production, Assembly, Integration, & Test) Authority to Proceed date. This approach decreases the likelihood that the long lead parts will need design changes after procurement. This also provides the Government with flexibility in timing of ordering CLIN 2 and will have some positive impact on the successful performance of the contract. The second Strength is for a complete, feasible, reasonable, and effective approach for a robust sparing strategy. SpaceX's approach enables the company to react quickly to anomalies and failures during testing, assembly, and integration, therefore reducing the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV, enhancing the potential for successful contract performance.

The evaluated Weakness relates to an incomplete approach to USDV Propulsion Subsystem component and sub-assembly risk mitigation when addressing schedule impacts of the work needed to decrease identified complex, open technical risks to acceptable levels for the USDV mission. These issues increase schedule risk that the USDV will not be delivered to the Government by the contractually required delivery date in August 2028, increasing the risk of unsuccessful USDV contract performance. Performance in these areas could impact mission schedules.

To sum, because SpaceX's Technical Approach proposal was evaluated as having three Significant Strengths and provides a comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit, and no Deficiency or Significant Weaknesses exist, the SEB rated the proposal for this subfactor as Excellent in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 2 – Management Approach (MA):
The SEB evaluated SpaceX's overall MA subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified two Strengths, resulting in a rating of Good. There were no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies identified.

The first Strength is for a management approach that effectively utilizes existing relevant SpaceX technical and management teams that can immediately support the USDV effort and a flat organizational structure enabling effective communication, therefore reducing the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV.

The second Strength is for use of well-established and well-organized internal system engineering management tools and systems, with readily accessible remote read/write capabilities for the Government, demonstrating an effective management approach, well-integrated with the Government's insight and approval needs. SpaceX's proposed approach is a feasible and effective approach to reduce the risk of technical mismanagement of the design and production process. SpaceX's approach demonstrates an understanding of the Government's need for near real-time insight and provides effective tools for implementing that insight, reducing the risk of unexpected technical and schedule impacts and enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

To sum, because SpaceX's Management Approach proposal was evaluated as having two Strengths, and no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies, and shows a reasonably sound response, where weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response, the SEB rated the proposal for this subfactor as Good in accordance with the definition in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 3 - Small Business Utilization (SBU):
The SEB evaluated SpaceX's overall SBU subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified one Strength, resulting in a rating of Good. There were no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies identified.

The Strength is for a reasonable and sound independent assessment for SpaceX to achieve its small business subcontracting goals. SpaceX is utilizing its Commercial Subcontracting Plan, and proposed a phased approach to subcontracting, which is consistent with its overall approach to USDV and aligns small business involvement with specific, suitable phases. This phased approach includes a preponderance of subcontracting goals in small business categories for all but the first two years of contract performance. SpaceX proposes to utilize established corporate procedures for small business outreach to support the achievement of the goals and commitments in its Commercial Subcontracting Plan. This reasonable and sound approach to small business subcontracting expands opportunities for small business participation in Government requirements, thereby increasing NASA's ability to provide maximum practicable opportunities for small businesses at the subcontract level in accordance with the Small Business Act.

To sum, because SpaceX's SBU proposal was evaluated as having one Strength, and no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies, and shows a reasonably sound response, where weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response, the SEB rated the proposal for this subfactor as Good in accordance with the definition in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Past Performance

The SEB evaluated SpaceX's Past Performance volume in accordance with the criteria defined in Provisions L.28 and M.4 of the RFP, and assessed SpaceX a Very High Level of Confidence rating.

The SEB evaluated the three past performance narratives provided in SpaceX's proposal; Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) reports; Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) reports; a safety, health, and environmental review; and conducted interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Beyond the contracts identified in the SpaceX proposal, the SEB identified two additional contracts in CPARS that were recent and relevant to the USDV contract.

All five of the evaluated contracts are within the RFP recency period. More recent and more relevant past performance received greater consideration in the performance level of confidence assessment. The SEB determined there were two Very Relevant and three Relevant contracts. The two Very Relevant contracts were determined to have overall Excellent performance. The three Relevant contracts were determined to have Very Good performance.

The SEB evaluated Safety, Health, and Environmental past performance, and assigned a rating of 'satisfactory,' based primarily on information submitted for the sites proposed for performance on USDV.

Small Business subcontracting and utilization past performance was evaluated as excellent. SpaceX is meeting or exceeding nearly all of its recorded small business goals. SpaceX has consistently exceeded most or all small business subcontracting goals in its commercial subcontracting plan.

To sum, in assigning a Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor, SpaceX's relevant past performance was determined to be of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner, and very minor problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on SpaceX's performance record, there is a Very High Level of Confidence that SpaceX will successfully perform the required effort.

<u>Offeror 2 – NG</u>

Cost/Price

NG's TEP is significantly higher than SpaceX's TEP. NG's proposal received was evaluated for its proposed Total Evaluated Cost and/or Price. The Government performed the cost and/or price evaluation in accordance with FAR 15.305 - Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 - Proposal Analysis, and NFS 1815.305 - Proposal Evaluation. The USDV CLIN structure (e.g., CLIN 1, either CPIF or FFP; CLIN 2, either CPIF or FFP; CLIN 3-5 FFP) determined the proposal analysis techniques that were performed to ensure that the final agreed-to price is fair and reasonable in accordance with FAR 15.404-1.

NG elected to submit a proposal utilizing CPIF for CLINs 1, 2, and 2A, and FFP for CLINs 3, 4 and 5, in response to the solicitation. Under the Cost/Price factor, other than certified cost or pricing data is required. The SEB conducted a cost realism analysis (for CLINs 1, 2, and 2A) and price analysis (for all CLINs) on NG's proposed Total Evaluated Cost and Price to ensure the final agreed-to price is fair and reasonable in accordance with USDV RFP section M.2. No cost adjustments were determined to be necessary in performing the cost realism analysis for CLINs 1, 2, and 2A. NASA did not make any adjustments to the FFP for CLINs 3-5. The Government's cost and price analysis determined NG's price to be fair and reasonable based on a comparison of proposed prices received in response to the USDV solicitation, as well as compared to the IGCE. The CO determined that adequate competition was present based on two responsible/responsive Offerors, competing independently, submitting prices satisfying the Government's expressed requirement and found the prices were reasonable. NG's cost proposal was determined to be realistic.

Mission Suitability

The SEB evaluated NG's Mission Suitability (Volume II) proposal in accordance with the criteria defined in provisions L.27 and M.3 of the RFP. NG's proposal received an overall score of 589 out of 1,000 points for the Mission Suitability factor. The SEB identified a total of three Strengths and seven Weaknesses. No Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies were identified. Below is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of NG's proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors:

Mission Suitability Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach (TA):
The SEB evaluated NG's overall TA subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified two Strengths and six Weaknesses, resulting in a rating of Good. There were no Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies identified.

The first Strength is for an effective approach demonstrates an overall understanding of the USDV requirements through the use of flight-proven and derived-from-flight-proven designed components. NG's approach increases the likelihood of producing a reliable USDV, minimizes new development and testing, reduces the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV, and enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

The second Strength is for a reasonable and effective approach to conduct robust hazard analysis, incorporate systems safety, reliability, and quality assurance functions within the USDV design process, and convene internal NG safety review panels prior to phased safety reviews with the NASA ISS Safety Review Panel (ISRP). These components of NG's Safety and Mission Assurance (SMA) approach are an effective means to ensuring safety and reliability informed design and successful completion of the ISS safety review process, reducing the risk of failure during the USDV mission, increasing the likelihood of successful contract performance.

The first Weakness relates to an incomplete hardware spares procurement approach. This approach increases schedule and technical risk if failures are experienced during testing or

ground processing, necessitating procurement of additional flight or qualification units, increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

The second Weakness is for incomplete Failure Tolerance identification in the SMA approach and a lack of demonstrated understanding of NASA's approval authority and processes for dispositioning major nonconformances. These components of NG's SMA approach introduce the technical risk of producing a less reliable USDV, as well as associated schedule risks, both of which increase the risk of unsuccessful USDV contract performance.

The third Weakness relates to a lack of demonstrated understanding of the NASA approval authority for alternate or tailored standards, increases the technical risk of the USDV not meeting the NASA requirements, and increases the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV.

The fourth Weakness relates to an ineffective approach to the CLIN 2 Authority to Proceed date, which carries inherent schedule risks of having to perform re-work or re-procurement, thereby increasing the risk of late delivery of the USDV and of unsuccessful contract performance.

The fifth Weakness relates to an ineffective approach to limit the final four-day reentry phase to a subset of Solar Beta Angles and decreases the Government's flexibility in planning dates to deorbit the ISS. NG's proposed approach increases the risk of additional design modifications to the electrical power system to meet the USDV requirements, leading to increased risk of schedule delay to deliver USDV by the required delivery date of May 2029, and increases risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

The sixth Weakness is related to NG's proposed approach for the USDV propulsion subsystem. The proposal did not include a complete approach for the overall propulsion subsystem integrated testing and verification, nor a complete description of associated risks to be mitigated by such testing, thereby increasing technical risk that the subsystem will experience unexpected issues during ISS deorbit operations and increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

To sum, NG's Technical Approach proposal was assessed as having two Strengths and six Weaknesses. The SEB found that the Technical Approach overall shows a reasonably sound response, where weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response, and therefore rated the proposed subfactor as Good. This rating is in accordance with the definition of NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 2 – Management Approach (MA):
The SEB evaluated NG's overall MA subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified one Weakness, resulting in a rating of Good. There were no Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies identified.

The weakness identified relates to NG's proposed approach for NASA insight into the USDV. NG's approach demonstrates a lack of understanding of the NASA insight requirements by making NASA attendance at key Contractor technical/programmatic meetings subject to pre-

coordination with and approval by NG's proposed USDV Insight Manager. This proposed approach is an ineffective means to adequately identify and manage USDV technical and schedule risks via NASA insight, increasing the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

To sum, NG's Management Approach proposal was assessed as having one identified Weakness. The SEB found that the management approach overall shows a reasonably sound response, where weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response, and therefore rated the proposed subfactor as Good. This evaluation was done in accordance with the definition in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 3 - Small Business Utilization (SBU):
The SEB evaluated NG's overall SBU subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. The SEB identified one Strength, resulting in a rating of Good. There were no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies identified.

The Strength is for a reasonable and sound independent assessment for NG to achieve its small business subcontracting goals. NG is utilizing its Commercial Subcontracting Plan and proposed a phased approach to subcontracting, which is consistent with its overall approach to USDV. NG proposes to utilize established corporate procedures for small business outreach, including its participation in the NASA and Department of Defense Mentor Protégé programs, to achieve the goals in its Commercial Subcontracting Plan. NG's reasonable and sound approach to small business subcontracting expands opportunities for Small Business participation in Government requirements, thereby increasing NASA's ability to provide maximum practicable opportunities for small businesses at the subcontract level in accordance with the Small Business Act.

To sum, because NG's SBU proposal was assessed as having one Strength, and no Significant Strengths, Weaknesses, Significant Weaknesses, or Deficiencies, and shows a reasonably sound response, where weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response, the SEB rated the proposed subfactor as Good. This was assessed in accordance with the definition in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) as referenced in the RFP's Section M.1.

Past Performance

The SEB evaluated NG's Past Performance volume in accordance with the criteria defined in Provisions L.28 and M.4 of the RFP, and assessed NG to have a Moderate Level of Confidence rating.

The SEB evaluated the three past performance narratives provided in the NG proposal; publicly available information; CPARS reports; eSRS reports; a safety, health, and environmental review; and conducted interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Beyond the contracts identified in the NG proposal, the SEB identified one additional contract in CPARS that was recent and relevant to the USDV contract.

NG's relevant past performance is pertinent to the USDV effort and has demonstrated effective performance which was fully responsive to contract requirements. Reportable problems exist but with little identifiable effect on the overall performance. More recent and more relevant past performance received greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment. The SEB determined there were one Very Relevant, two Relevant, and one Somewhat Relevant contracts. The Very Relevant contract was determined to have overall Excellent performance. The Relevant contracts had Marginal and Very Good histories of performance, respectively. The Somewhat Relevant contract had a Satisfactory history of performance.

Safety, Health, and Environmental past performance was evaluated as Very Good based primarily on information provided for the locations proposed to be utilized for USDV build.

Small Business subcontracting and utilization past performance was evaluated as Marginal.

To sum, in assigning a Past Performance Level of Confidence rating, NG's relevant past performance was determined to be pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance. Performance was fully responsive to contract requirements; while there may have been reportable problems but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on NG's performance record, there is a Moderate Level of Confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

SELECTION DECISION

During its presentation on June 3, 2024, I questioned the SEB on its evaluation, and I carefully considered the material presented, both at the briefing and provided to me ahead of time. I also requested and considered the comments of the senior officials and SEB advisors who attended the briefing. The SEB Chair stated that there were no dissenting opinions among the SEB members. The charts presented appropriately summarized the SEB's evaluation of the proposals. As the SSA, I examined the SEB's evaluation of each factor and subfactor and I considered the evaluations of each of the proposals. I found that the evaluations were done in accordance with the USDV RFP and its evaluation criteria. As the SSA, it is my responsibility to make an independent judgment of the SEB's evaluation results and to determine whether I agree with the evaluation results or not. I determined that the SEB systematically evaluated each proposal in accordance with the RFP, documented its evaluations, participated in meaningful and equal discussions with both Offerors, explained its findings of strengths and weaknesses appropriately, documented its rationale for its Past Performance ratings and Cost/Price analysis, and conducted a meaningful comparison as part of the Cost/Price evaluation. The SEB provided detailed answers to follow-up questions I had during the meeting. As the SSA, I understand the merits, technical and otherwise, and the qualitative aspects of each proposal. I am confident that the SEB did its due diligence in conducting its review in a fair and impartial manner and I take no exception to the SEB's evaluation results.

CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROPOSALS

SpaceX

In considering each proposal individually, I concur with the SEB's evaluation and find that SpaceX Mission Suitability has a total of three Significant Strengths, five Strengths and one Weakness. In addition, SpaceX has past performance that is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, demonstrating exemplary performance. Based on the relevancy of SpaceX's past performance, I concur with the SEB that there is a Very High Level of Confidence that SpaceX can successfully perform the USDV required effort. In evaluating SpaceX's price proposal, I concur with the SEB that this proposal represents the significantly lower TEP of the two Offerors.

For the Mission Suitability factor, I note that SpaceX's proposal was assessed a Significant Strength for its effective, feasible, and reasonable technical approach, which reuses flight-proven hardware and software designs, and uses flight-proven component designs for the newly designed vehicle section, increasing the likelihood of producing a highly reliable USDV that minimizes new development and testing, and reduces the risk of late delivery. SpaceX's approach greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. SpaceX also received a Significant Strength for its reasonable and effective approach to ensuring that safety and mission assurance concepts influence all aspects of USDV design and operations, which increases the likelihood of producing a highly reliable USDV within the required schedule. Finally, under its third Significant Strength, SpaceX's proposal provides a reasonable, effective, and feasible technical approach to Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation that mitigates the technical risk and reduces the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV through early identification of technical issues. I also reviewed and agree with the Board's assessment of the two assigned Strengths for SpaceX's Technical Approach and the assigned Strength for SpaceX's Small Business Utilization. While the Management Approach subfactor was not as distinguishing a factor for me as the Technical Approach subfactor, I note that SpaceX garnered two Strengths in its proposal evaluation. The first SpaceX Strength was for the effective use of existing Dragon technical and management teams that can immediately support the USDV effort, along with a flat organizational structure that enables effective communication, reducing the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV. Another SpaceX Strength under Management Approach is the demonstrated understanding of the Government's need for near real-time insight, with SpaceX providing effective tools for implementing that insight, and reducing the risk of unexpected technical and schedule impacts.

While SpaceX's proposal has three Significant Strengths, it also has one Weakness. The sole Weakness in the Technical Approach relates to an incomplete approach that increases schedule risk to the USDV contractually required delivery date in August 2028. While SpaceX acknowledges it can perform flow testing of the proposed configuration, if required, SpaceX did not baseline this flow testing into its schedule. In addition, there are identified, open technical risks that have not yet been mitigated to an acceptable level. The necessary mitigations may impact delivery schedule requirements. However, I find that the SpaceX Weakness is correctable through the normal contractual administration processes without requiring significant changes to the Technical Approach proposal. The potential schedule impacts are localized to the

issues encompassed in this Weakness. This is a complex procurement for a unique requirement, which eludes perfected paperwork in the proposal process, despite the parties' engagement in meaningful discussions. NASA has a history of doing hard things, and I understand the nature of our work and the necessity of iterative development during the creation of a deliverable such as USDV. This is a practice that NASA understands, based on its technologically innovative history. I am willing to accept the risks identified in the Weaknesses in SpaceX's Technical Approach.

NG

I concur with the SEB's evaluation and find that NG's Mission Suitability has been evaluated as having no Significant Strengths, three Strengths, seven Weaknesses and no Significant Weaknesses. In addition, NG has past performance that is pertinent to this acquisition, demonstrating effective performance. Based on this Offeror's performance record, I concur with the SEB that there is a Moderate Level of Confidence that NG could successfully perform the USDV required effort. I understand the SEB's logic in rating NG's Past Performance as a Moderate Level of Confidence and do not necessarily disagree with this rating, as it was in accordance with the listed definitions.

In evaluating NG's Price/Cost, NASA did not make any probable cost adjustments. I concur with the SEB that NG's proposal represents the significantly higher Total Evaluated Probable Cost/Price of the two Offerors.

I note that NG's Mission Suitability proposal did not have any Significant Strengths. By definition, under the applicable provisions of NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A), none of the evaluated subfactors under Mission Suitability could be rated above the classification of "Good" without an identified Significant Strength. I note that NG did have Strengths identified for the use of flight-proven, and derived from flight-proven, designed components; for a reasonable and effective Safety and Mission Assurance approach; and for a reasonable and sound independent assessment to achieve its small business subcontracting goals.

While NG's Mission Suitability proposal did have three Strengths, it also had seven Weaknesses. The Weaknesses were in both the Technical Approach and Management Approach subfactors. The Weaknesses with technical impacts were of greater concern to me. These Weaknesses included issues with NG's sparing strategy, NG's incomplete propulsion subsystem integrated testing, NG's incomplete Failure Tolerance identification, NG's lack of demonstrated understanding of the NASA approval authority for alternate or tailored standards, and NG's lack of understanding of NASA insight requirements. Each of these identified Weaknesses create a technical risk to successful contract performance. In addition, the Weakness for NG's availability of deorbit capabilities during NG-identified Solar Beta Cutouts, and NG's ineffective CLIN 2 Authority to Proceed date create schedule risks. In fact, all of the identified Weaknesses have an associated schedule risk except for the NG Weakness regarding incomplete propulsion subsystem integrated testing. I have particular concern regarding the NG proposal's multiple technical risk impacts as the RFP made clear that "[t]he primary objective of this contract is to procure a safe, reliable, and cost-effective deorbit vehicle to meet NASA's International Space Station (ISS) end-of-life deorbit mission requirements." (RFP Section C, Statement of Work,

Section 1.1) These technical risks directly impact NASA's ability to secure a safe and reliable vehicle. The multiple findings that create schedule risk also create risk to the reliability of the USDV. NASA must be able to safely deorbit the ISS. This risk does not necessarily end with the launch of the USDV. Particularly concerning are NG's proposed Solar Beta Cutouts that would limit NASA's ability to deorbit the ISS on particular days. With this Weakness, NASA is faced with having to choose between a potentially lengthy and costly redesign of the NG system that would allow NASA more flexibility when scheduling the ISS deorbit operations, or the launch of a USDV that limits NASA's planned deorbit schedule.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS

I appreciate both SpaceX and NG for their time and effort spent in preparing their proposals for the USDV contract. It is so important that NASA has a robust contractor community to support our important mission directives because we all benefit from the technical diversity offered and I am confident that this competitive procurement process has challenged both Offerors to expand their capabilities for the next generation of Human Space Flight and Exploration.

I have considered the SEB's evaluation of each proposal and base my award decision on the entirety of the written documentation and information provided to me. In my independent evaluation of the SEB's evaluation results, I determined that the proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP, and I have considered the following language from the Solicitation in reaching the award decision:

The Price factor is approximately equal to the combined importance of the Mission Suitability factor and Past Performance factor. As individual factors, Mission Suitability factor is more important than Past Performance factor.

I have considered the evaluation findings for both proposals, in detail, against the Price factor, the Mission Suitability factor, and the Past Performance factor.

Past Performance was a factor that I considered in this award decision, but it was not as important a discriminator as the Mission Suitability factor. NG was assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence that this Offeror will successfully perform the required effort under the USDV contract, whereas SpaceX was assessed as having a Very High Level of Confidence that SpaceX will successfully perform the required effort under the USDV contract. While not a key discriminator in this selection decision, SpaceX has the advantage over NG in the Past Performance factor.

For the Mission Suitability Management Approach subfactor, the SEB evaluated both SpaceX and NG proposals as "Good." I recognize the value that both Offerors bring to NASA and value the proposed Management Approach presented by each. However, the SpaceX proposal was evaluated as having two Strengths while the NG proposal garnered one Weakness for this subfactor. I find some value in the SpaceX Strength that effectively uses existing Dragon technical and management teams that can immediately support the USDV effort, along with a

flat organizational structure that enables effective communication, reducing the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV. Likewise, there is value in the SpaceX Strength that demonstrates an understanding of the Government's need for near real-time insight, providing effective tools for implementing that insight, and reducing the risk of unexpected technical and schedule impacts. While I see more discriminators in the Technical Approach aspects of this comparative evaluation, SpaceX has an advantage over NG in the Management Approach subfactor.

Under the Mission Suitability Technical Approach subfactor, SpaceX's proposal has three Significant Strengths, and NG's has none. The Technical Approach subfactor was the most heavily weighted of the Mission Suitability subfactors. The SpaceX proposal provides discernable value, particularly with its Significant Strength for the reuse of flight-proven hardware and software designs, and the use of flight-proven component designs for the newly designed vehicle section. Because all sections of the vehicle include flight proven component design, this increases the likelihood of producing a highly reliable USDV that minimizes new development and testing, reducing the risk of late delivery. SpaceX's approach greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. While NG received a Strength for the use of flight-proven and derived from flight-proven designed components, there is a substantive difference between the two proposals. That is, NG's proposed approach uses components from six existing vehicles. The various components have not been flown in an integrated configuration. Specifically, while I agree with the Board's finding that NG's approach does increase the likelihood of producing a reliable USDV, minimizes new development and testing, reduces the risk to the Government of late delivery of the USDV, and enhances the potential for successful contract performance; in comparison to the SpaceX approach the multiple sources of NG's components make the NG approach less reliable and potentially riskier than SpaceX's homogeneous proposal.

In addition, I find the multiple NG Weakness' impact on technical and schedule risk to be a discriminator in this award decision. SpaceX has a strong advantage over NG in the Technical Approach subfactor.

For the Mission Suitability factor, I commend both Offerors for their strengths in the Small Business subfactor. Both SpaceX and NG proposed a reasonable and sound independent assessment to achieve their small business subcontracting goals. I appreciate both approaches and do not see one as a competitive advantage over the other.

To sum, in considering all aspects of the Mission Suitability findings for both Offerors, weighing all the benefits and the risks presented, I find that SpaceX's Mission Suitability proposal is superior and has a clear advantage over NG's Mission Suitability proposal.

With regard to the Price/Cost factor, the USDV CLIN structure determined the proposal analysis techniques that were performed and ensured that the final agreed-to price was fair and reasonable in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. Based on the details provided to me by the SEB, I find that both the SpaceX TEP and the NG Total Evaluated Probable Cost/Price are fair and reasonable. Additionally, there was adequate price competition. SpaceX's proposed price is fair and

reasonable, is significantly less expensive than NG's proposal, and represents the best value to the Government. I concur with the evaluated Cost/Price determinations presented and find that the competition was conducted on an equal and common basis. Overall, SpaceX offers NASA a substantial advantage by proposing to complete the requirements for the USDV at a much lower dollar value than NG's proposal.

I have reviewed all the evaluation findings and have concluded:

- SpaceX has the highest Mission Suitability score, the highest Past Performance Rating, and a significantly lower Total Evaluated Price.
- NG has the lowest Mission Suitability score/ratings, the lower Past Performance Rating, and a significantly higher Total Evaluated Probable Cost/Price.

While both Offerors provide Strengths in their proposals, only SpaceX's proposal offers Significant Strengths. The Weakness identified in SpaceX's proposal relates to potential risk to schedule, and based on the specific nature of this Weakness, I find that the concerns can be addressed and resolved during routine contract administration. NG's seven Weaknesses create both technical and schedule risks, that when viewed wholistically, impact reliability and increase risk of successful contract performance. I have examined and concur with the SEB's evaluation of proposals and recommendations. My independent analysis finds value to NASA in SpaceX's superior Mission Suitability, higher Past Performance rating, and significantly lower priced proposal.

I have full confidence that SpaceX can perform the requirements of USDV efficiently, effectively, and in a safe manner. I have considered the relative value and impact of the evaluation factors in the context of their relative importance in accordance with the solicitation and determine that awarding SpaceX the United States Deorbit Vehicle (USDV) Contract under solicitation 80JSC023R0003 is the best value to the Government.

original signed by

Kenneth Bowersox
Source Selection Authority