



## **Source Selection Statement**

Next Space Technologies for Exploration Partnerships -2  
(NextSTEP-2)

Appendix N: Sustainable Human Landing System  
Studies and Risk Reduction

Broad Agency Announcement  
NNH19ZCQ001K\_APP\_N

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

September 13, 2021

## **I. Introduction**

In my role as the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA or Agency) Human Landing System (HLS) Appendix N procurement, for the reasons set forth below, I select the following firms for contract awards: Blue Origin Federation, LLC; Dynetics, A Leidos Company; Lockheed Martin Corporation; Northrop Grumman Corporation; and Space Exploration Technologies Corporation. This selection statement documents my independent analysis and judgment as the SSA and constitutes my final determination on this matter.

## **II. Procurement Description**

NASA recognizes the need to foster the commercial development of expertise and technologies required for reusable, sustainable, and human-rated landing systems. As one component of multiple HLS procurements, Appendix N will help NASA and U.S. industry accomplish this goal by procuring critical studies and risk reduction activities in support of sustainable human lunar lander services. Not only will this work meaningfully advance the research and development necessary to meet NASA's long-term crewed lunar landing requirements, but it will also have commercial applications beyond NASA's needs.

To that end, NASA employed a public-private partnership model for this procurement, using fixed-price research and development contracts. On July 1, 2021, NASA issued Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) NNH19ZCQ001K\_APP\_N for Sustainable Human Landing System Studies and Risk Reduction. This BAA is Appendix N to NASA's NextSTEP-2 BAA (the Omnibus BAA). Offerors were required to structure the tasks, associated activities, and deliverables into severable contract line item numbers (CLINs) integrated with priced milestones such that the Government is able to quickly negotiate and activate CLINs and individual tasks based on programmatic priorities and funding availability. The Appendix N CLINs are:

- CLIN 001, HLS Sustaining Requirements Feedback, Concept Trades, and Initial Specification Development
- CLIN 002, Sustainable Lunar Lander System Risk Reduction
- CLIN 003, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) - Special Studies Task Orders
- CLIN 004, Sustaining Lander Concept Maturation and Final Review (Option)

Offerors were required to propose against, at a minimum, CLINs 001 and 004. Proposals that were not responsive to both of these CLINs were ineligible for selection or award. Offerors were also permitted to propose against CLIN 002 by proposing one or more discrete risk reduction task orders. Offerors did not propose against CLIN 003; NASA will use this CLIN during contract performance to solicit for specific study task orders on an as needed basis.

The solicitation established certain Not-to-Exceed (NTE) values. The Appendix N award decisions described herein were made in accordance with these values, and offerors were also asked to comply with these values when submitting their proposals. First, the solicitation established that when performing Total Evaluated Price calculations, the Government would include the cost of any Optional Government furnished Equipment or Property (Optional GFE/GFP), as well as the cost of any Government Task Agreements (GTAs). Next, the

solicitation stated that the Total Evaluated Price of the sum of CLIN 001 and *initially funded* CLIN 002 risk reduction tasks funded shall not exceed \$45M. To ensure that award decisions were made in accordance with this restriction, for each offeror, I selected CLIN 002 tasks for *initial* funding such that, when the price of these tasks is added to the offeror's CLIN 001 price, their requested Optional GFE/GFP, and their associated GTAs, the sum is at or below a total of \$45M.

In addition, the solicitation provided that the Total Evaluated Price of the sum of CLIN 001, CLIN 004, and *all funded* CLIN 002 risk reduction tasks shall not exceed \$100M. To ensure that award decisions were made in accordance with this restriction, for each offeror, I selected CLIN 002 tasks for initial funding and other CLIN 002 tasks as selectable at a later date such that, when the price of *all* of these CLIN 002 tasks is added to the offeror's CLIN 001 price, and the offeror's CLIN 004 price, as well as their requested Optional GFE/GFP and their associated GTAs, the sum is at or below a total of \$100M.

The maximum possible period of performance for Appendix N will be thirty-six (36) months. The CLIN 001 period of performance is up to four (4) months and will commence at ATP (Authority to Proceed). The CLIN 004 period of performance, if NASA exercises this contract option, will be up to 8 (eight) months in length and will commence immediately upon the contractor's completion of CLIN 001. The CLIN 002 period of performance will commence at ATP and last no longer than fifteen (15) months; individual tasks proposed against CLIN 002 were required to have a period of performance no longer than twelve (12) months. CLIN 003 activities may be ordered by NASA at any time during Appendix N contract performance.

### **III. Proposal Evaluation Methodology Overview**

Under Appendix N BAA, NASA solicited for firm fixed-price proposals in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 6.102(d)(2) and 35.016. BAAs are not negotiated procurements conducted on the basis of competitive proposals. As such, NASA did not conduct a comparative analysis and trade-off amongst proposals. Rather, each proposal was evaluated on its own individual merits. However, although proposals were not directly compared to one another, nor any trade-off determinations made between or among proposals, the solicitation specified that NASA may consider funding availability when making final award determinations.

After receipt of proposals, the Source Evaluation Panel (SEP) appointed to evaluate Appendix N proposals began its evaluation. Consistent with FAR 35.016(e), the primary basis for selecting one or more proposals for award is technical, importance to Agency programs, and funds availability, as delineated through the Appendix N BAA's evaluation factors and areas of focus: Relevance (Factor 1); Technical Approach (Factor 2); and Price (Factor 3). The Technical Approach factor is more important than the Relevance factor, which is more important than Price. When combined, Factors 1 and 2 are significantly more important than Factor 3.

Within Factors 1 and 2, the solicitation established specific areas of evaluation. For each offeror's proposal, for CLINs 001, 002, and 004, the SEP identified findings for these areas of evaluation (as defined below). The SEP then considered these findings in their totality to determine a single adjectival rating for each of Factors 1 and 2, per applicable CLIN. Offerors' price proposals did not receive an adjectival rating. Elements of an offeror's proposal that merely

met the Government’s requirements were ineligible for a finding of either a strength or a weakness. In such cases, the SEP did not create findings.

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Strength</b>	An aspect of the proposal that will have some positive impact on the successful performance of the contract and/or that exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
<b>Weakness</b>	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
<b>Deficiency</b>	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

*Table 1: Findings Definitions*

Adjectival ratings definitions as applicable to Factors 1 and 2 were as follows:

<b>Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Outstanding</b>	A thorough and compelling proposal of exceptional merit that fully responds to the objectives of the BAA. Proposal contains strengths that far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is very low.
<b>Very Good</b>	A competent proposal of high merit that fully responds to the objectives of the BAA. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is low.
<b>Acceptable</b>	A competent proposal of moderate merit that represents a credible response to the BAA. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance.
<b>Marginal</b>	A proposal of little merit. Proposal does not clearly demonstrate an adequate approach to and understanding of this BAA’s objectives. Weaknesses outweigh strengths. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is moderate to high.
<b>Unacceptable</b>	A seriously flawed proposal that is not responsive to the objectives of this BAA. The proposal has one or more deficiencies or multiple weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct. The proposal is unawardable.

*Table 2: Adjectival Ratings Definitions*

For Factor 3, Price, the SEP calculated a Total Evaluated Price for each offeror inclusive of the offeror’s proposed amounts for CLINs 001, 002, and 004, plus the cost associated with any Optional GFE/GFP and the cost of any GTAs. The SEP also evaluated each offeror’s Total

Evaluated Price for price reasonableness using techniques identified in FAR 15.404-1(b).

#### **IV. Source Selection Determinations**

Seven offerors, listed below in alphabetical order, submitted timely proposals by the due date of August 2, 2021:

- Blue Origin Federation, LLC (Blue Origin)
- Blue Ridge Nebula Starlines (Blue Ridge)
- Cook & Chevalier Enterprises (Cook & Chevalier)
- Dynetics, A Leidos Company (Dynetics)
- Lockheed Martin Corporation (Lockheed Martin)
- Northrop Grumman Corporation (Northrop Grumman)
- Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (SpaceX)

Based upon the proposals submitted and NASA's initial evaluation thereof, five of these offerors—Blue Origin, Dynetics, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, and SpaceX—remain eligible for selection and award.<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Appendix N solicitation, NASA may make zero, one, or multiple awards. NASA's overarching strategy is to make awards that support the most competitive environment practicable, partnering with one or more commercial firms under Appendix N to maximize industry's ability to provide future sustainable lunar transportation services.

At the end of August 2021, the SEP presented me with a briefing detailing the results of its evaluation of each offeror that remained eligible to receive an Appendix N contract award at that time. I have thoroughly studied and reviewed this briefing. It is my determination that the evaluation results documented therein, including the findings, adjectival ratings, narrative rationales, and the Total Evaluated Prices were created in accordance with the evaluation criteria and methodology set forth in the Appendix N solicitation. Further, it is my determination that this evaluation record has a rational basis, is thoroughly documented, and provides me with information regarding the qualitative merits and drawbacks of each offeror's proposal that is sufficient to support my selection decisions. As such, with any exceptions noted on a case by case basis, I otherwise fully concur with and adopt the SEP's evaluation record as documented in its briefing. This briefing is the primary basis for all decisions made herein, and such decisions represent my independent judgement as the Agency official solely responsible for selections in this procurement. Below are the evaluation results for each offeror and the basis for their selection to receive a contract award.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the evaluation methodology provided within the HLS solicitation, I concurred with the removal of Blue Ridge and Cook & Chevalier as recommended by the Contracting Officer from further consideration for award earlier in the source selection process.

<sup>2</sup> Note that due to the highly proprietary nature of certain elements of the offerors' proposals, including many of the details related to the task orders proposed by offerors under CLIN 002, this publicly-available selection statement does not contain my complete rationale in support of my selection determinations. It would not be appropriate to provide trade secrets and similar information within this document in light of additional forthcoming competitive HLS and other NASA procurement(s).

## **A. Blue Origin**

### **CLIN 1 Evaluation**

#### *Factor 1 (Relevance): Outstanding*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Blue Origin's proposal as Outstanding for Factor 1, Relevance. I agree with this assessment. This aspect of Blue Origin's proposal is thorough and compelling, of exceptional merit, and fully responds to the objectives of this BAA. The relevance of their technical approach and business plan provides an outstanding list of technologies that will help facilitate future crewed lunar surface landings and provides a phased approach for extensible technology maturation to get to Mars.

#### *Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Outstanding*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Blue Origin's proposal as Outstanding for Factor 2, Technical Approach. I agree with this assessment. Blue Origin's proposal is thorough and compelling, of exceptional merit, and fully responds to the objectives of this BAA. Blue Origin's approach to systems engineering anchors the use of Design Analysis Cycles that iterate a design through continuous loops of maturation, providing valuable data for additional risk mitigation if required. Of significant note is Blue Origin's use of a Technical Evaluation Committee that provides an independent review prior to any key milestone with the Government.

### **CLIN 2 Evaluation**

For CLIN 002, Blue Origin proposed a total of seventeen (17) risk reduction task orders. I have selected four (4) of these task orders to be initially funded by NASA at time of contract award, and another four (4) of these task orders as selectable to be potentially ordered by NASA during contract performance. For all eight (8) of these task orders, the SEP assigned adjectival ratings for Relevance and Technical Approach of either Outstanding or Very Good. I have reviewed these ratings and fully concur with them. Blue Origin's initially funded task order work includes risk-reduction activities related to the propulsion, guidance, navigation, and control, docking, and lunar dust mitigation systems of their sustainable HLS architecture.

### **CLIN 4 Evaluation**

#### *Factor 1 (Relevance) and Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Outstanding*

For CLIN 004, Blue Origin's proposal built off of its CLIN 001 approach, maturing its concept design and verification, validation, and certification plan development. The SEP found Blue Origin's CLIN 004 proposal to be Outstanding for both Relevance and Technical Approach, and I agree with this assessment. CLIN 004 is an option that NASA may exercise during contract performance at its unilateral discretion.

### **Price Evaluation**

The SEP evaluated Blue Origin's Total Evaluated Price as reasonable and balanced. I concur with these conclusions. The total value of the initially funded Appendix N scope of work for Blue Origin rounded to the nearest dollar is \$25,570,932.

### **Selection Rationale**

My selection determination for Blue Origin's proposal is based upon the results of its evaluation considered in light of the Agency's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEP's evaluation of Blue Origin's proposal across the solicitation's evaluation criteria, as well as the relative weighting of those criteria as stated therein. This analysis leads me to the conclusion that Blue Origin's proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Agency, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in this solicitation. Specifically, I conclude that the relevance and technical approach of Blue Origin's proposal provides value for NASA at its Total Evaluated Price. Therefore, I select Blue Origin for a contract award.

## **B. Dynetics**

### **CLIN 1 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance): Very Good*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Dynetics' proposal as Very Good for Factor 1: Relevance. I agree with this assessment. The SEP found that Dynetics builds off of its corporate heritage in the space industry and extensive partnering agreements, and is fully capable of maturing technologies important for sustained lunar systems. Dynetics' specific architecture has attributes of high merit for sustainable landers, including a viable future commercial path. This aspect of Dynetics' proposed approach is beneficial to creating a sustainable commercial lunar economy.

*Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Acceptable*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Dynetics' proposal as Acceptable for Factor 2: Technical Approach. I agree with this assessment. Technically, mass challenges in implementing new technologies include a potential for significant re-design for a 4-crew configuration. There are offsetting strengths and weaknesses in the technical approach which has moderate merit overall, including a strong systems engineering approach counterbalanced with lacking maturation plans in several identified low Technology Readiness Level (TRL) items with no associated system concept risks. I found Dynetics' proposal technically acceptable for the HLS sustaining requirements maturation scope of work of CLIN 001.

### **CLIN 2 Evaluation**

For CLIN 002, Dynetics proposed a total of twenty-four (24) risk reduction task orders. I have selected sixteen (16) of these task orders to be initially funded by NASA at time of contract award, and the remaining eight (8) task orders as selectable to be potentially ordered by NASA during contract performance. For these task orders, the SEP assigned adjectival ratings for Relevance and Technical Approach ranging from Acceptable to Outstanding, with the majority of ratings assigned as Very Good. I have reviewed these ratings and fully concur with them. Dynetics' initially funded task order work includes risk-reduction activities related to the power, propulsion, guidance, navigation, and control, and docking systems of their sustainable HLS architecture.

#### **CLIN 4 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance) and Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Very Good & Acceptable*  
For CLIN 004, Dynetics' proposal is an extension of its CLIN 001 proposal with respect to detail and quality. This proposal continues maturing Dynetics' concept design, including verification, validation, and certification plan development. The SEP found Dynetics' CLIN 004 proposal to be Very Good for Relevance and Acceptable for Technical Approach, and I agree with this assessment. CLIN 004 is an option that NASA may exercise during contract performance at its unilateral discretion.

#### **Price Evaluation**

The SEP evaluated Dynetics' Total Evaluated Price as reasonable and balanced. I concur with these conclusions. The total value of the initially funded Appendix N scope of work for Dynetics rounded to the nearest dollar is \$40,804,969.

#### **Selection Rationale**

My selection determination for Dynetics' proposal is based upon the results of its evaluation considered in light of the Agency's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEP's evaluation of Dynetics' proposal across the solicitation's evaluation criteria, as well as the relative weighting of those criteria as stated therein. This analysis leads me to the conclusion that Dynetics' proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Agency, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in this solicitation. Specifically, I conclude that the relevance and technical approach of Dynetics' proposal provide sufficient value for NASA at its Total Evaluated Price. Therefore, I select Dynetics for a contract award.

### **C. Lockheed Martin**

#### **CLIN 1 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance): Outstanding*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Lockheed Martin's proposal as Outstanding for Factor 1, Relevance. I agree with this assessment. Lockheed's proposal includes an architecture and specific technologies that collectively demonstrate an attractive approach for the development of a sustainable lunar lander with features that are significantly applicable to NASA as well as the commercial space industry.

*Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Outstanding*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Lockheed Martin's technical approach as Outstanding for Factor 2, Technical Approach. I agree with this assessment. The SEP found that the proposal is thorough and compelling and addresses feasible concepts to benefit Lockheed's architecture.

### **CLIN 2 Evaluation**

For CLIN 002, Lockheed's proposed a total of seven (7) risk reduction task orders. I have selected three (3) of these task orders to be initially funded by NASA at time of contract award, and the remaining four (4) task orders as selectable to be potentially ordered by NASA during contract performance. For all of these task orders, the SEP assigned adjectival ratings for Relevance and Technical Approach of either Outstanding or Very Good. I have reviewed these ratings and fully concur with them. Lockheed Martin's initially funded task order work includes risk-reduction activities related to the propulsion system of their sustainable HLS architecture.

### **CLIN 4 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance) and Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Outstanding*

For CLIN 004, Lockheed's proposal built off of its CLIN 001 proposal and is exceptional in detail and quality. This proposal continues maturing Lockheed's concept design, including verification, validation, and certification plan development. As such, the SEP assigned a rating of Outstanding for both the Relevance and Technical Approach of Lockheed's CLIN 004 proposal. I agree with these conclusions. CLIN 004 is an option that NASA may exercise during contract performance at its unilateral discretion.

### **Price Evaluation**

The SEP evaluated Lockheed Martin's Total Evaluated Price as reasonable and balanced. I concur with these conclusions. The total value of the initially funded Appendix N scope of work for Lockheed Martin rounded to the nearest dollar is \$35,185,207.

### **Selection Rationale**

My selection determination for Lockheed Martin's proposal is based upon the results of its evaluation considered in light of the Agency's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEP's evaluation of Lockheed Martin's proposal across the solicitation's evaluation criteria, as well as the relative weighting of those criteria as stated therein. This analysis leads me to the conclusion that Lockheed Martin's proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Agency, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in this solicitation. Specifically, I conclude that the relevance and technical approach of Lockheed Martin's proposal provide excellent value for NASA at its Total Evaluated Price. Therefore, I select Lockheed Martin for a contract award.

## **D. Northrop Grumman**

### **CLIN 1 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance): Very Good*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Northrop Grumman's proposal as Very Good for Factor 1, Relevance. I agree with this assessment. The SEP found that Northrop Grumman builds off corporate heritage in the space industry and is fully capable of maturing important technologies. Northrop Grumman has a strong systems engineering model, including the use of Model Based System Engineering and Design Analysis Cycles to perform the necessary trades and design maturation. I found this to be beneficial to the HLS sustaining requirements maturation tasks within CLIN 001.

*Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Very Good*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated Northrop Grumman's proposal as Very Good for Factor 2, Technical Approach. I agree with this assessment. Although the proposal lacks some detail in planning, it is competent in its overall approach and is of high merit to the HLS Program.

**CLIN 2 Evaluation**

For CLIN 002, Northrop proposed a total of six (6) risk reduction task orders. I have selected two (2) of these task orders to be initially funded by NASA at time of contract award, and another four (4) of these task orders as selectable to be potentially ordered by NASA during contract performance. For all six (6) of these task orders, the SEP assigned adjectival ratings for Relevance and Technical Approach ranging from Marginal to Outstanding, with Very Good as the most commonly assigned rating. I have reviewed these ratings and fully concur with them. Northrop Grumman's initially funded task order work includes risk-reduction activities related to the propulsion and docking systems of their sustainable HLS architecture.

**CLIN 4 Evaluation**

*Factor 1 (Relevance) and Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Very Good*

For CLIN 004, Northrop's proposal built off of its CLIN 001 approach, maturing its concept design and verification, validation, and certification plan development. The SEP found Northrop's CLIN 004 proposal to be Very Good for both Relevance and Technical Approach, and I agree with this assessment. CLIN 004 is an option that NASA may exercise during contract performance at its unilateral discretion.

**Price Evaluation**

The SEP evaluated Northrop Grumman's Total Evaluated Price as reasonable and balanced. I concur with these conclusions. The total value of the initially funded Appendix N scope of work for Northrop Grumman rounded to the nearest dollar is \$34,770,330.

**Selection Rationale**

My selection determination for Northrop Grumman's proposal is based upon the results of its evaluation considered in light of the Agency's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEP's evaluation of Northrop Grumman's proposal across the solicitation's evaluation criteria, as well as the relative weighting of those criteria as stated therein. This analysis leads me to the conclusion that Northrop Grumman's proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Agency, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in this solicitation. Specifically, I conclude that the relevance and technical approach of Northrop Grumman's proposal provide appropriate value for NASA at its Total Evaluated Price. Therefore, I select Northrop Grumman for a contract award.

## **E. SpaceX**

### **CLIN 1 Evaluation**

#### *Factor 1 (Relevance): Very Good*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated SpaceX's proposal as Very Good for Factor 1, Relevance. I agree with this assessment. SpaceX's proposal builds upon their vehicle design and extensive capability for both crew and cargo. The relevance of this proposal is of high merit with their business plan that provides areas for commercialization including heavy lift launch capability for multiple or very large satellite delivery to Earth's orbits, as well as co-manifested crew and large cargo capacity to the Moon.

#### *Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Outstanding*

For CLIN 001, the SEP evaluated SpaceX's proposal as Outstanding for Factor 2, Technical Approach. I agree with this assessment. SpaceX's exceptional technical approach leverages design solutions that have previously been demonstrated and certified for human space flight (e.g., the Dragon spacecraft and the Falcon 9 launch vehicle) and state of the art infrastructure, including key facilities and equipment used for production and testing.

### **CLIN 2 Evaluation**

For CLIN 2, SpaceX proposed one (1) risk reduction task order. I have selected this task order to be initially funded by NASA at time of contract award. For this task order, the SEP assigned the adjectival rating of Very Good for both Relevance and Technical Approach. I have reviewed these ratings and fully concur with them. SpaceX's initially funded task order work includes risk-reduction activities related to landing site analysis for its sustainable HLS architecture.

### **CLIN 4 Evaluation**

#### *Factor 1 (Relevance) and Factor 2 (Technical Approach): Very Good & Outstanding*

For CLIN 004, SpaceX's proposal built off of its CLIN 001 approach, maturing its concept design and verification, validation, and certification plan development. The SEP found SpaceX's CLIN 004 proposal to be Very Good for Relevance and Outstanding for Technical Approach, and I agree with this assessment. CLIN 004 is an option that NASA may exercise during contract performance at its unilateral discretion.

### **Price Evaluation**

The SEP evaluated SpaceX's Total Evaluated Price as reasonable and balanced. I concur with these conclusions. The total value of the initially funded Appendix N scope of work for SpaceX rounded to the nearest dollar is \$9,427,952.

### **Selection Rationale**

My selection determination for SpaceX's proposal is based upon the results of its evaluation considered in light of the Agency's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEP's evaluation of SpaceX's proposal across the solicitation's evaluation criteria, as well as the relative weighting of those criteria as stated therein. This analysis leads me to the conclusion that SpaceX's proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Agency, and that it aligns with the objectives as

set forth in this solicitation. Specifically, I conclude that the relevance and technical approach of SpaceX's proposal provide exceptional value for NASA at its Total Evaluated Price. Therefore, I select SpaceX for a contract award.

## V. Conclusion

In light of the five remaining Appendix N offerors' evaluation results and in consideration of NASA's available funding, it is my determination that the award of the above-described contracts and their respective CLIN 002 task orders is in the best interests of the Agency. To meet sustainable lunar mission needs starting in the late 2020s, the HLS Program currently plans to utilize the Lunar Exploration Transportation Services (LETS) solicitation. Although NASA's acquisition strategy is subject to change at any time, NASA currently envisions LETS as a full and open competition. As an effort that precedes LETS, the primary objective of the Appendix N contracts is thus to engage with potential commercial partners for concept studies, sustaining HLS concept of operations (ground and flight) development, and risk reduction activities to better prepare NASA's industry partners for robust LETS competition. These five Appendix N awards will undoubtedly achieve NASA's Appendix N objectives, including greatly enhancing industry's capabilities for future HLS and other NASA procurements.

LISA WATSON-  
MORGAN



Digitally signed by LISA  
WATSON-MORGAN  
Date: 2021.09.13  
19:14:44 -05'00'

---

Dr. Lisa Watson-Morgan  
Human Landing System SSA