

## **Selection Statement for the Independent Assessments for Systems Analysis and Concepts Development**

### **RFP NNL11376266R**

On September 21, 2011, I met with the Source Evaluation Team (SET) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Independent Assessments for Systems Analysis and Concepts Development.

#### **I. PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION**

I appointed the members of the SET which included representation from the Legal Office, the Systems Analysis and Concepts Development Directorate, and the Procurement Office in memorandum dated March 14, 2011. The Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Independent Assessments for Systems Analysis and Concepts Development was released on May 3, 2011. The RFP required the Offerors to provide the necessary management, personnel, equipment, and supplies to provide conceptual hypersonic and launch vehicle design, analysis, and optimization, technology assessment, and systems analysis related design environments and analytical tool development, verification and validation and to assist Government personnel with the assessment and integration of a diverse set of exploration architecture design configurations to yield sustainable and affordable solutions for human and robotic campaigns in support of agency stakeholders. The SOW also provides element-level definition for strategic campaign analysis, including defining and assessing the performance, cost, and risk characteristics of systems to support development and assessment activities for robotic systems, crewed and uncrewed systems, and surface systems and independent science mission analysis evaluating technical scope, trajectory analysis, orbital mechanics assessment, and feasibility of cost and schedule. This work includes, but is not limited to, independent assessment capabilities for space transportation, human and robotic architectures, campaign analysis and life cycle assessments.

This effort will be performed as a cost reimbursement, indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) type contract. Under the resulting contract, task orders will be issued authorizing work. The contract consists of a five-year period of performance.

Two amendments were issued to the RFP:

Amendment No. 1 was released on May 19, 2011, and provided Offerors with answers to written questions received in response to the RFP.

Amendment No. 2 was released on June 13, 2011, and provided Offerors with answers to a final question submitted in response to the RFP as well as revisions to the RFP as a result of the question. These revisions included:

- (1) Section L.11 Volume II - Business Proposal, (7)d. has been amended to provide clarity within the first and last paragraphs, and shall read as follows: The first paragraph "d. A completed Form 2, for each year, which will reflect each subcontract and/or consultant, if proposed. In accordance with Form 2, Offerors shall include the following for each proposed subcontract and/or

consultant:" The last paragraph "Note: The sum of the prices required in item (vi) above shall equal the total cost for subcontracts and/or consultants listed in Form 1. Form 2, the sum for each applicable contract year is to be reflected in Form 1, (cell data reference H22)."

(2) Cost Form 1 has been amended to include "Subcontracts and/or Consultants" as an element of cost were it was inadvertently omitted from the list of cost elements.

(3) Cost Form 2 has been amended to reflect Total Subcontract "and/or Consultant" Cost. In addition, the following note is added: "Note: Copy this form for each applicable contract year in which subcontract and/or consultants proposed costs are expected to exceed \$1,000,000.00 over five years, if subcontracting/consulting is anticipated and is known at proposal submission." to provide clarity.

The Government designated this procurement as a 100 percent small business set-aside under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 19.5. The procurement was conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15, entitled "Contracting by Negotiation." On, June 20, 2011, proposals were received from the following companies:

Advatech Pacific, Inc.

KinetX, Inc.

Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc.

## **II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. The Government evaluated the proposals in two general steps:

**Step One** – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all information was provided in accordance with RFP Sections L.5 – L.9, and that the Offeror made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. A review of the Online Representations and Certifications Application database, Excluded Parties List System, and Central Contractor Registration was completed for each Offeror to ensure they were not debarred or suspended and were registered in Central Contractor Registration. Additionally, a list of the Offerors was provided to Legal Counsel to assist with Confidential Financial Disclosure Form (OGE Form 450), and Public Financial Disclosure Form (SF 278) reviews for SET appointees.

**Step Two** – All acceptable proposals (only 1 remained as discussed below in Section III) were evaluated against the three evaluation factors contained in the RFP. Evaluations were completed on the basis of material presented and substantiated in the Offeror's proposal and not on the basis of what may have been implied. Vague statements were interpreted as a lack of understanding on the part of the Offeror and/or an inability to demonstrate adequate qualifications and

resources. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option to utilize one of the following methods: (1) Make selection and award without discussions; or (2) after discussions with all the finalists, afford each Offeror an opportunity to revise its proposal, and then make selection.

Overall, in the selection and award, the Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance factors were of essentially equal importance. The Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors, when combined, were significantly more important than the Cost factor.

The three evaluation factors are described as follows:

**Mission Suitability:** Mission Suitability consisted of one subfactor, and the subfactor was evaluated for strengths and weaknesses. Within the response to the subfactor, the offerors discussion of programmatic risk to mission success, e.g., capabilities, technical, schedule, cost, safety, occupational health, security, export control, or environmental were evaluated.

#### Subfactor 1: Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach (URTA)

NASA evaluated the offeror's understanding of the following four work elements, including but not limited to application of analytical tools, technical challenges, risks, approaches for performance, and the technical disciplines necessary for performance. NASA evaluated the analytical tools to be applied to this contract and the number, qualifications, and commitment of personnel to be utilized on this contract to perform the following:

1. Campaign analysis of human and robotic exploration architectures including assessing campaign performance, cost, risk characterization, mission operations and affordability.
2. Design concepts, analysis and optimization of hypersonic atmospheric flight and advanced launch vehicles, including those with scramjet-based propulsion systems, as well as trade studies, the development of performance requirements, technology assessments and risk characterization.
3. Launch vehicle ground operations modeling and analysis including process flow diagrams, ground operations simulations including discrete event modeling, quantification of ground operations related Figures of Merit, process flow requirements, and technology trades.
4. Design concepts and analysis of spacecraft and related subsystems supporting human and robotic planetary exploration missions, as well as trade studies, the development of performance requirements, technology assessments and risk characterization.

Overall, each Offeror would receive a Mission Suitability adjective rating of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," or "Poor" as set forth and described in the NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305.

Each member of the SET performed a detailed, individual review of Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc's technical proposal before reviewing the business proposal. Individual findings for the technical proposal, stated in the form of individual strengths or weaknesses, were recorded. In caucus and with all SET members present, the SET evaluated each finding, determined its merit for the technical proposal and also determined whether it was significant and assigned adjective

ratings to the technical findings for the Subfactor and Mission Suitability Factor. Because the Advatech Pacific, Inc. and KinetX, Inc. proposals were determined to be unacceptable as discussed in Section III below, the SET did not evaluate either offeror's Mission Suitability proposal.

**Cost:** An analysis of the proposed cost elements and fee was performed to assess cost realism and the Offeror's capability to accomplish the contract objectives within the cost proposed. A lack of resource realism may adversely affect Mission Suitability scores, and result in cost realism adjustments under the cost factor. The evaluation addressed the sum of the resources, skill mix, and labor categories required to realistically conduct the Independent Assessments for Systems Analysis and Concepts Development services, as proposed by the Offeror. Unrealistic or unreasonable costs and inconsistencies between the Mission Suitability volume and the Cost volume were assessed as a proposal risk. Price reasonableness was determined based on adequate price competition and a cost realism analysis.

It should be noted that an initial cost analysis was performed on the Advatech and KinetX proposals, which was sufficient to assess the proposals and confirm that adequate price competition existed. However, once these proposals were determined to be unacceptable, as discussed in Section III below, no additional evaluation of the cost proposals was performed.

The Cost/Price Analyst determined adequate price competition existed and price reasonableness was established. Additionally, each member of the SET individually reviewed the schedule of rates contained in Spaceworks' Business Proposal. The SET members evaluated the table of rates contained in the Spaceworks business proposal and concurred that the rates are commensurate with current market rates for similar expertise of this nature.

**Past Performance:** Overall corporate or offeror past performance was evaluated by the SET, but not the past performance of individuals who are proposed to be involved in the required work. The confidence rating assigned to Past Performance reflects consideration of information contained in the proposal, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references such as PPIRS and CPARS, that the Government used for additional past performance information. Omissions or an inaccurate or inadequate response to an evaluation factor had a negative effect on the overall evaluation. Emphasis was given to the extent of the direct experience and quality of past performance on previous contracts that were highly relevant to the effort defined in the SOW. Past Performance was not numerically scored; however, a confidence level was assigned based on the definitions included in the RFP and in NFS 1815.305(a)(2). The possible Confidence Level ratings are Very High, High, Moderate, Low, and Very Low.

The Confidence Level ratings had both a "performance" component and a "pertinence" component. The offeror had to meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular confidence level rating. In assessing performance, the SET made an assessment of the offeror's overall performance record. The SET evaluated the offeror's past performance record for meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, occupational health, safety, security, mission success, and other contract requirements. Isolated or infrequent problems that were not severe or persistent, and for which the Offeror took immediate and appropriate corrective action, did not reduce the offeror's rating. On the other hand, ratings were reduced when problems were within

the contractor's control and were significant, persistent, or frequent, or when there was a pattern of problems or a negative trend of performance. In assessing pertinence, the SET considered the degree of similarity in size (in dollars per year), work content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the recency, and duration of the past performance with more recent and/or longer duration work being considered more pertinent.

The evaluation of each Offeror's written narrative summarizing its record of past performance related to Independent Assessments for Systems Analysis and Concepts Development, including the performance of subcontractors, if applicable was conducted. Evaluation included submitted RFP Attachment 2, Past Performance Questionnaire, as completed and returned by the Offeror's clients and describing the Offeror's performance in several critical areas on relevant contracts. Additionally, official past performance reports on the prime offerors and their subcontractors, when those evaluations were available through the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System, were evaluated.

Each member of the SET independently performed a detailed review of the Past Performance Volume in its entirety, for each individual offeror, to ensure past performance credit for all SOW areas. Individual ratings for the Past Performance Volume, stated in the form of adjective ratings, were completed. In caucus and with all SET members present, the SET evaluated each past performance assessment for size pertinence, content pertinence, and complexity pertinence to reach adjective rating consensus.

### **III. DISPOSITION AND EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

After the initial evaluation performed in Step 1 above, the SET began evaluation of the Past Performance Volumes for all Offerors, and the Cost/Price Analyst began evaluation of the Business (Cost) Volumes for all Offerors. These evaluations were conducted in parallel. Upon completion of the Cost/Price Analyst report, the findings were discussed with the SET Members, the Contracting Officer, and Legal Counsel. It was determined by the Contracting Officer two of the Offerors were noncompliant with the requirements of the RFP, and were determined to be unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70. Only one of the three offers received was determined to be acceptable, and was fully evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP.

Advatech Pacific, Inc. and KinetX, Inc. did receive evaluations of the Past Performance Proposals submitted since they were being evaluated before the Contracting Officer's decision of noncompliance was made and those ratings are included herein. The evaluation of the Advatech Pacific, Inc. and KinetX, Inc. Business and Technical Proposals were not completed as discussed below.

Proposals submitted by Advatech Pacific, Inc. and KinetX, Inc. were determined to be unacceptable based on the following.

The proposal submitted by Advatech Pacific, Inc. was found to be noncompliant with material requirements of the RFP due to discrepancies between the Technical, Business, and Past Performance volumes. Advatech Pacific, Inc. submitted three cost scenarios on its electronic CD, while the hard copy Business Proposal contained only one cost scenario. The hard copy

cost scenario contained in the Business Proposal took precedence per the RFP instructions. The Technical and Past Performance Volumes proposed subcontracting efforts, but the hard copy of the Business Proposal did not propose costs for subcontracting. As a result, the SET concluded that there were conflicts between the Technical, Business, and Past Performance Volumes, therefore, the Offeror's understanding of the RFP requirements and the manner in which the work would be performed could not be determined.

The proposal submitted by KinetX, Inc. failed to meet material requirements of the RFP. KinetX, Inc. did not meet the requirements of FAR Clause 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting. KinetX proposed that its employees perform 47.85% of the labor cost of contract performance while subcontractors would perform 52.15% of the labor cost of contract performance. Additionally, the contractor's completed CLIN 1 proposed costs for contract years 1 – 5 (Cost Form 1), and Subcontracts and/or Consultants proposed costs (Cost Form 2) which identify subcontracting efforts exceeding \$1M. Contrary to the requirements of Section L.11(8) of the RFP, neither a Business nor Past Performance proposal was submitted for the significant subcontractors (exceeding \$1M).

Letters were sent to both companies on August 12, 2011 notifying them that NASA had removed their proposals from further consideration and would not accept any revisions or clarifications. Both companies responded via letters dated August 17, 2011, and August 15, 2011, for Advatech and KinetX, respectively. NASA sent follow up letters to KinetX and Advatech dated August 29, 2011. Advatech responded via letter dated August 30, 2011, and NASA provided a response via letter dated September 16, 2011. No follow-up correspondence has been received since then.

The findings of the Source Evaluation Team were presented to me September 21, 2011.

#### **IV. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

The evaluation results, by Offeror, of the proposals received are summarized below.

##### **Advatech Pacific, Inc.**

In the **Mission Suitability factor**, Advatech Pacific, Inc. was not rated as discussed above. The proposal submitted by Advatech Pacific, Inc. was considered to be noncompliant with material requirements of the solicitation due to discrepancies between the technical, cost, and past performance volumes. The Offeror's understanding of the RFP requirements could not be determined.

In the **Past Performance factor**, Advatech Pacific, Inc. received a performance rating of very good and pertinence rating of pertinent. Overall, there is a Moderate level of confidence that Advatech Pacific, Inc. can perform the effort. These ratings are summarized as follows:

**Rating Rationale:** Advatech Pacific, Inc's past performance was rated as very good as demonstrated on several Advatech Pacific, Inc. Government contracts, and significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton effort performed on several Government contracts. Advatech Pacific, Inc. demonstrated pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, integrated performance

analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems, and conceptual trade studies; with very highly pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.6 and 3.7 for developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing capabilities. Overall, there is a Moderate level of confidence that Advatech Pacific, Inc. can perform the effort.

**Performance:** Advatech Pacific, Inc., in conjunction with its significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton, received customer ratings ranging from excellent to poor/unsatisfactory on RFP Attachment 2, Past Performance Questionnaires. Comments from RFP Attachment 2 evaluations for Advatech Pacific, Inc. customers addressed excellent to poor performance on Government contracts. Comments from RFP Attachment 2 evaluations for significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton customers reflected excellent ratings for all rated work elements on Government contracts. The rating of poor was not reviewed with Advatech as it was no longer considered for award.

In the aggregate, the SET considered Advatech Pacific, Inc's., in conjunction with its significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton, overall performance to be very good.

**Pertinence of Experience:** Advatech Pacific, Inc., in conjunction with its significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton, demonstrated pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, integrated performance analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems, and conceptual trade studies. Advatech Pacific, Inc., in conjunction with its significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton, demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.6 and 3.7 for developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing capabilities.

In the aggregate, the SET considered Advatech Pacific, Inc's., in conjunction with its significant subcontractor Booz, Allen, Hamilton, overall pertinence of experience to be pertinent.

In the **Cost factor**, A cost realism and price reasonableness analysis was not completed for Advatech Pacific, Inc. The proposal submitted by Advatech Pacific, Inc. was found to be noncompliant with material requirements of the solicitation due to discrepancies between the technical, cost, and past performance volumes. The Offeror's understanding of the RFP requirements could not be determined as indicated above.

### **KinetX, Inc.**

In the **Mission Suitability factor**, KinetX, Inc. was not rated. The proposal submitted by KinetX, Inc. failed to meet material requirements of the RFP. KinetX, Inc. did not meet the requirements of FAR Clause 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting. KinetX proposed that its employees perform 47.85% of the labor cost of contract performance while subcontractors would perform 52.15% of the labor cost of contract performance. Additionally, the contractor's completed Cost Form 1 and Cost Form 2 identify subcontracting efforts exceeding \$1M. Contrary to the requirements of Section L.11(8) of the RFP a Business or Past Performance proposal was not submitted for the significant subcontractors.

In the **Past Performance factor**, KinetX, Inc. received a performance rating of excellent and a pertinence rating of somewhat pertinent. Overall, there is a low level of confidence that KinetX, Inc. can perform the effort. These ratings are summarized as follows:

**Rating Rationale:** KinetX, Inc's past performance was rated as excellent to very good as demonstrated on its commercial contract. KinetX, Inc. demonstrated somewhat pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7 for integrated performance analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems, developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing capabilities. There was no demonstrated experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, and 3.5 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, and conceptual trade studies. Overall, there is a low level of confidence KinetX, Inc. can perform the effort.

**Performance:** KinetX, Inc. received customer ratings ranging from excellent to very good based on RFP Attachment 2, Past Performance Questionnaires for its commercial contracts.

In the aggregate, the SET considered KinetX, Inc's overall performance to be Excellent.

**Pertinence of Experience:** KinetX, Inc. demonstrated somewhat pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, and 3.7 for integrated performance analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems, developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing capabilities. KinetX, Inc. did not demonstrate experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, and 3.5 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, and conceptual trade studies.

In the aggregate, the SET considered KinetX, Inc's overall pertinence of experience to be somewhat pertinent.

In the **Cost factor**, A cost realism and cost price reasonableness analysis was not completed for KinetX, Inc. The proposal submitted by KinetX, Inc. failed to meet material requirements of the RFP, as the proposal did not meet the requirements of FAR Clause 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting as indicated above.

### **Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc.**

In the **Mission Suitability factor**, Spaceworks received numerous strengths and weaknesses. However, the weaknesses were not significant and do not outweigh the strengths, and therefore did not warrant discussions. The weaknesses are a direct result of Spaceworks providing past performance examples and methodologies within the Technical Volume, but failing to explicitly state how these examples and methodologies will be applied to their performance of this contract. Spaceworks received an adjective rating of Good for Mission Suitability.

Overall strengths were assigned for Factor 1, for the areas of risk and approach to performance, for all the subfactor elements which include:

- Campaign Analysis
- Design Concept, Analysis and Optimization of Hypersonic Atmospheric Flight and Advanced Launch Vehicles

- Launch Vehicle Ground Operations Modeling
- Design Concepts and Analysis of Spacecraft and Related Subsystems Supporting Human and Robotic Planetary Exploration Mission

Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough understanding of programmatic risk to mission success associated with successful performance of the contract which included effective processes to manage and mitigate such risks. A second strength was found because Spaceworks recognized that coupling analytical tools with appropriate technical discipline expertise ensures effective independent analysis. Additionally, the approach recognizes proven analysis methodologies which distinguish the differences between system analyses and systems engineering.

Strengths were assigned for the subfactor element of Campaign Analysis for Spaceworks in the areas of application of analytical tools and its approach to performance. Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough understanding of the analytical tools required to conduct campaign analysis of human and robotic exploration architectures, and proposed an extensive suite of in-house and industry standard tools relative to this work and supports all aspects of campaign analysis, including campaign performance, cost, risk characterization, missions operations, and affordability. Additionally, Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough approach to the performance of campaign analysis of human and robotic architectures in the area of risk characterization and provided a detailed description of risk characterization in terms of technical performance and higher level risk such as program risk. Spaceworks also demonstrated a thorough understanding of uncertainty analysis of proposed architectures and the complexity of risk characterization. Weaknesses associated for Campaign Analysis were assigned in the areas of approach to performance and personnel qualifications. The weaknesses were a result of Spaceworks providing past performance examples within the Technical Volume, and a failure to document the methodologies to be applied in Spaceworks approach to performance on this contract. Also, for the area of personnel qualification, Spaceworks failed to specify the number, qualifications, and commitment of personnel to be utilized on this contract and this expertise did not appear in any of the biographies within the Technical Volume.

For the subfactor element, Design Concept, Analysis and Optimization of Hypersonic Atmospheric Flight and Advanced Launch Vehicles Spaceworks received strengths for application of analytical tools and personnel qualifications. Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough understanding of the analytical tools associated with design analysis of hypersonic atmospheric flight and advanced launch vehicles, as they proposed an extensive list of relevant in-house and industry standard tools to perform design and analysis appropriate to this effort. The proposed approach covers all aspects of launch vehicle conceptual design. Spaceworks demonstrated well qualified personnel in the area of design concepts, analysis, and optimization of hypersonic atmospheric flight and advanced launch vehicles. Spaceworks personnel have expertise in relevant disciplines and serve on internationally recognized technical committees. These personnel will provide quality independent assessment of hypersonic atmospheric flight and advanced launch vehicles. Weaknesses for this subfactor element were assigned in the areas of technical challenges and approach to performance. The technical challenge weakness is a result of Spaceworks providing past performance examples within the Technical Volume, but failing to document how these examples are germane to the technical challenges of designing scramjet-based propulsion systems and advanced launch vehicles on this contract. Also, Spaceworks provided past performance examples within the Technical Volume for approaches to

performance, but failed to document in the Technical Volume its approach for implementation on this contract.

For the subfactor element Launch Vehicle Ground Operations Modeling, Spaceworks received a strength for its application of analytical tools, and a weakness for its personnel qualifications. Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough understanding of the analytical tools required to conduct launch vehicle ground operations modeling as they proposed an extensive suite of relevant in-house and industry standard tools that support analyses including process flow diagrams, ground operations simulations with discrete event modeling, quantification of ground operations related Figures of Merit, process flow requirements, and technology trades. However, Spaceworks also received a weakness for failing to specify the number, qualifications, and commitment of personnel to be utilized on this contract and this expertise did not appear in any of the biographies within the Technical Volume.

For the subfactor element Design Concepts and Analysis of Spacecraft and Related Subsystems Supporting Human and Robotic Planetary Exploration Mission, Spaceworks received a strength for application of analytical tools. Spaceworks demonstrated a thorough understanding of the analytical tools required to design concepts and perform analysis of spacecraft systems and related subsystems by proposing an extensive suite of relevant in-house and industry standard tools that support trade studies, the development of performance requirements, technology assessments and risk characterization.

In the **Past Performance factor**, Spaceworks received a performance rating of excellent and a pertinence rating of highly pertinent. Overall, there is a high level of confidence that Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc. can perform the effort. These ratings are summarized as follows:

**Rating Rationale:** Spaceworks past performance was rated as excellent as demonstrated by performance on Government contracts. Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc. demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, integrated performance analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), conceptual trade studies, developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing capabilities. Spaceworks demonstrated highly pertinent experience in SOW area 3.4 for concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems. Overall there is a high level of confidence Spaceworks can perform the effort.

**Performance:** Spaceworks received customer ratings ranging from excellent to good based on RFP Attachment 2, Past Performance Questionnaire. Comments from RFP Attachment 2 evaluations for Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc. reflected customer ratings ranging from excellent to good on Government and commercial contracts, task orders, and purchase orders.

In the aggregate, the SET considered Spaceworks overall performance to be Excellent.

**Pertinence of Experience:** Spaceworks demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in SOW areas 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7 for vehicle conceptual design and analysis, technology assessments, integrated performance analysis (human and robotic missions and architectures), conceptual trade studies, developing and delivering analytical tools, and assessing existing

capabilities; and highly pertinent experience in SOW area 3.4 for concept development and analysis of spacecraft systems.

In the aggregate, the SET considered Spaceworks overall pertinence to be Highly Pertinent.

In the **Cost factor**, Spaceworks proposed a cost of \$3,348,140 and price reasonableness was determined by the SET on the basis of adequate price competition, price analysis, and cost realism analysis. The SET determined a probable cost of \$3,348,140 to be fair and reasonable. The Government's probable cost and Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc's proposed costs are equal in the amount of \$3,348,140. The SET determined the proposed rates to be commensurate with current market value for similar expertise, and aligned with rates estimated in the Independent Government Cost Estimate. There are no concerns with labor rates and the values are as expected. This is an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) contract with a not to exceed ceiling of \$9.5M over a five year period of performance.

## V. DECISION

The SET presented the findings to me on September 21, 2011. I considered the requirement for the SSA to comparatively assess the proposal against all evaluation criteria in the RFP in order to make an integrated assessment of each offeror and comparatively evaluate competing offerors. After the SET's presentation that covered all findings for Mission Suitability, Price/Cost and Past Performance, I considered the relative importance of Mission Suitability and Past Performance, which, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost, in the award decision.

Based on my integrated assessment of Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc.'s proposal with its Mission Suitability factor rating of Good which contained numerous strengths and weaknesses, a probable cost factor of \$3,348,140, and Past Performance factor rating of a High Level of Confidence, together with its compliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP, demonstrates to me that its offer represents an effective approach to fulfill the Government's requirements. In considering the SET's findings, I determined that Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc.'s proposal is the Offeror capable of performing the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. Accordingly, I direct the Contracting Officer to award a contract to Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc.

//Original Signed and on File//

September 29, 2011

---

Susan E. McClain  
Source Selection Authority

---

Date