Source Selection Statement
for the
Exploration Extravehicular Activity Services (xEVAS) Contract
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
(Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006)

On April 26, 2022, the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Exploration Extravehicular Activity (EVA) Services (xEVAS) contract, under Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006, presented its final evaluation to me and other senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). I considered the information presented and contemplated my decision. I met with advisors, including the Contracting Officer and SEB Chairman, and announced my selection decision on May 3, 2022.

## Procurement Requirements

NASA has a need for EVA services capability to support its various human spaceflight missions. The International Space Station (ISS) program requires EVA capability to maintain the ISS vehicle through the life of the program. The Artemis campaign requires EVA capability to support sustainable lunar missions and to maintain the Gateway. Other programs or missions may identify a need for EVA capability during the performance period of this contract that would require xEVAS services to ensure mission success.

xEVAS is an indefinite-delivery indefinite-quantity contract with firm-fixed-price task orders. The ordering period is 10 years with a total period of performance of 12 years with no options. The ceiling not to exceed (NTE) value is $3,100,000,000 with an upward adjustment value of $400,000,000 for a total potential NTE value of $3,500,000,000.

## Chronology

Request for Information (RFI)/Sources Sought Synopsis (SSS)
On April 14, 2021, NASA issued an RFI/SSS to solicit comments from the industry regarding acquisition strategies through sam.gov under Notice ID 80JSC21XEVAS to provide the industry with the anticipated elements of the xEVAS procurement concept. These documents were provided as part of the Government's request for capabilities statements from interested parties. Industry responses to the RFI were received on May 6, 2021, and were considered in the overall procurement strategy.

Industry Day
May 13-18, 2021, NASA held a virtual Industry Day via Microsoft Teams and included virtual one-on-one meetings with interested parties for the xEVAS acquisition.

- May 13, 2021 – Industry Day and one-on-one meetings with interested parties
- May 14, 2021 – Continued one-on-one meetings with interested parties
- May 17, 2021 – Continued one-on-one meetings with interested parties

- May 18, 2021 – Continued one-on-one meetings with interested parties

Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)/RFI
On May 17, 2021, NASA issued an OCI/RFI for xEVAS.

Posting of Industry Day Questions and Answers
On May 28, 2021, NASA provided official responses to questions received during the xEVAS Industry Day.

Also, on this day, NASA provided links to virtual tours that NASA posted online to inform interested parties on the Johnson Space Center (JSC) capabilities.

Draft Request for Proposal
On July 27, 2021, NASA posted the xEVAS Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP). NASA requested industry to provide feedback on the DRFP no later than August 17, 2021.

Pre-solicitation Conference
On August 2-3, 2021, NASA held a virtual pre-solicitation conference via Microsoft Teams, including virtual one-on-one meetings with interested parties for the xEVAS acquisition.

- August 2, 2021 – Pre-solicitation conference and one-on-one meetings with interested parties
- August 3, 2021 – Continued one-on-one meetings with interested parties

Posting of Pre-solicitation Conference Questions and Answers
On August 16, 2021, NASA provided official responses to questions received during the xEVAS Industry Day and one-on-one meetings.

Pre-solicitation Synopsis
On September 3, 2021, NASA posted a pre-solicitation synopsis.

DRFP Question and Answers Posted
Industry questions and answers for xEVAS DRFP were posted on September 29, 2021

Request for Proposal
On September 29, 2021, NASA released the xEVAS Request for Proposal (RFP) and associated documents. Past performance (Volume III) proposals were due on November 1, 2021, while remaining volumes were due on December 1, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. (Central Daylight Time). The following xEVAS RFP amendments were issued:

- Amendment 1 – October 6, 2021; included various updates and changes.
- Amendment 2 – October 20, 2021; included various updates and changes.
- Amendment 3 – November 10, 2021; extended the proposal due date and included other various updates.
- Amendment 4 – January 13, 2022; extended the proposal due date for the alternate proposal required by Provision L.18.1(b)(1).
- Amendment 5 – March 4, 2022; extended the proposal due date for the alternate proposal required by Provision L.18.1(b)(1).

- Amendment 6 – April 1, 2022; requested final proposal revisions from the offerors in the competitive range and deleted the requirement for the alternate proposal required by Provision L.18.1(b)(1).

Amendment 3, on November 10, 2021, extended the proposal due date for initial proposals to December 14, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. (Central Daylight Time).

Pre-proposal Conference
On October 6, 2021, NASA held a virtual pre-proposal conference via Cisco Webex to discuss and highlight the RFP requirements. All interested parties were encouraged to attend.

Posting of Pre-proposal Conference Questions and Answers
On October 7, 2021, NASA provided official responses to questions received during the xEVAS Pre-proposal Conference.

RFP Questions and Answers
On October 20, 2021, NASA posted RFP questions and answers.

Receipt of Initial Proposals
Volume III (past performance) of the proposals were received by the due date of November 1, 2021. The remaining proposal volumes were received by the due date of December 14, 2021. No proposals were received late. The following offerors submitted proposals in response to the xEVAS RFP:

- Team Axiom Space (Axiom)
    - KBR, David Clark Company, Air-Lock, Arrow Science and Technology, A-P-T Research, Inc., Paragon Space Development Corporation, and Sophic Synergistics
- Team Collins Aerospace (Collins)
    - ILC Dover; Oceaneering Space Systems; Blue Origin, LLC; MRI Technologies; Bastion Technologies; M&B Engineering; and Honeybee Robotics

New Horizons Space submitted a past performance proposal but did not submit the remaining volumes.

Upon receipt of the initial proposals, the SEB conducted an initial review of the proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, "Identification of Unacceptable Proposals." The SEB found all proposals were acceptable in accordance with the solicitation and were evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in the RFP.

Competitive Range Determination
On February 24, 2022, the results of the initial evaluation were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and to the senior NASA officials in attendance. The SEB presented its evaluation to the SSA. This presentation included detailed evaluation results for each proposal, including Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price. I thoroughly discussed with the Board 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 both Offerors qualified as

the most highly-rated proposals and, therefore, should be included in the competitive range.

Discussions

On March 9, 2022, Axiom and Collins were notified of their inclusion in the competitive range and were provided the SEB's initial findings for Mission Suitability and Past Performance. The Offerors were instructed to provide a written response to those findings by March 18, 2022. Both offerors provided timely written responses that were reviewed by the SEB voting members. After reviewing the information provided in the written responses, the CO determined oral discussions were necessary to ensure an understanding between the parties with respect to the Government's findings and the offerors' written responses. The oral discussions were held between March 25, 2022 and March 31, 2022, which gave the parties an opportunity to provide any necessary clarification to the information exchanged during discussions. Communications continued between the Government and the offerors until discussions were closed on April 1, 2022.

As part of discussions, each Offeror was provided an opportunity to address any Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, or aspects of the proposal requiring further clarification, in writing, orally, and through proposal change pages.

Upon the conclusion of oral discussions, the CO requested the delivery of an interim model contract that reflected the updated terms and conditions coming out of oral discussions. The interim model contracts were submitted and reviewed by the SEB voting members to ensure the updated versions accurately reflected the updated terms and conditions that were discussed at the meetings held between March 25, 2022 and March 31, 2022. On April 1, 2022 discussions were closed and offerors were instructed to submit final proposal revisions.

Receipt of Final Proposal Revisions

The final proposal revisions were due and were received on April 5, 2022. No proposals were received late.

## Evaluation Process and Criteria

The final proposal revisions were evaluated in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15, NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815, and the xEVAS RFP. The RFP details the SEB evaluation factors and criteria contained in Section M of the RFP.

Upon receipt of the final proposal revisions, the SEB conducted an initial review of the proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of Unacceptable Proposals." The SEB determined all final proposal revisions were acceptable in accordance with the solicitation.

Proposals were evaluated by the SEB in accordance with the requirements of the RFP and applicable regulations, which include the FAR and the NFS. Subfactors were evaluated in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The SEB completed its evaluation activities and prepared charts to report its findings to the SSA, who is responsible for making the final source selection decision.

In accordance with the RFP, the Government will award none, one or more contracts resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror or offerors whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement is being conducted utilizing a combination of price, mission suitability, and past performance evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award. Order of importance of evaluation factors:

- The price factor is approximately equal to the combined importance of the mission suitability factor and past performance factor.
- For the individual factors, mission suitability factor is more important than past performance factor.

The Government evaluated each offeror's proposal using the factors and subfactors below. Although proposals are organized by factors and subfactors, the Government evaluated the proposals for consistency among proposal information, including the offeror's proposed model contract.

In addition, an Offeror must be considered responsible for award in accordance with FAR 9.104.

PRICE FACTOR

The Government performed price analyses of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) of both proposals. In addition, the Government performed price analyses of the TEP of both proposals, which was inclusive of all proposed rates and prices, to determine if the proposed TEP was reasonable. To ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable the Government performed these analyses in accordance with FAR 15.305, "Proposal Evaluation;" FAR 15.404, "Proposal Analysis;" and NFS 1815.305, "Proposal Evaluation."

The price analysis included an evaluation of the Fully Burdened team composite labor rates and TEP price analysis. The price analysis was performed by comparing the Independent Government Cost Estimate and the proposed prices received in response to the solicitation. Adequate price competition was obtained from this procurement, and, therefore, the prices proposed were determined to be fair and reasonable.

Cost analysis of other than certified cost or pricing data was not required to support a fair and reasonable price determination.

For purposes of the price evaluation, the TEP was considered, which consists of the summation of the following:

- The Offeror's average total proposed price per calendar year for each item in CLIN 1, multiplied by the Government-provided quantity for each item.
- The Offeror's average total proposed price per calendar year for each item in CLIN 2, multiplied by the Government-provided quantity for each item.
- The Offeror's proposed team composite labor rates for each year multiplied by the Government- provided quantity of hours per year for CLIN 4.

- The total value of Government Task Agreements (GTAs) proposed by the Offeror for the xEVAS effort.

While the Government acknowledges that the TEP does not reliably determine the exact cost to NASA for the work that will be performed under the xEVAS contract, I find that the RFP structured a TEP analysis that reasonably anticipates the potential contract costs in a way that allows for meaningful comparison of the submitted proposals. The SEB has appropriately applied the TEP analysis to the offerors' proposals.

MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability factor and associated subfactors were used to assess the ability of the offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the xEVAS contract. The Mission Suitability subfactors were evaluated and scored numerically based upon the subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance as set out below. These weights are used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

| Mission Suitability Subfactors | Weight |
|---|---|
| Subfactor 1. Technical Approach (TA) | 700 Points |
| Subfactor 2. Management Approach (MA) | 250 Points |
| Subfactor 3. Small Business (SB) Utilization (SBU) | 50 Points |
| TOTAL | 1000 Points |

Mission Suitability Subfactor 1, Technical Approach, evaluated each offeror's xEVA system architecture, service approach, extensibility plan, NASA insight and approval approach, engineering approach, and safety and mission assurance plan for overall demonstrated understanding, reasonableness, and feasibility.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 2, Management Approach, evaluated each offeror's program management plan, commercialization approach, and work plans for overall demonstrated understanding, reasonableness, and feasibility.

Mission Suitability Subfactor 3, SBU, evaluated each offeror's SB Subcontracting Plan (as applicable) for completeness, reasonableness, soundness, and commitment to the SB Program. Small business are not required to submit a SB Subcontracting Plan. Small businesses are evaluated pursuant to the RFP, which states "[T]the proposed amount of work to be done by the prime small business and first tier small business subcontractors will be evaluated against the Contracting Officer's overall subcontracting goal for this procurement."

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed on earlier work and can be an indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work at hand. The SEB evaluated the past performance of the offerors and their team members. The Government used both data provided by the offeror and data obtained from other sources. Three (3) aspects were taken into

consideration by the SEB when determining the offerors' past performance confidence rating. These aspects are: recency, relevance, and performance.

Only contract periods of performance within ten years from the date of the xEVAS original solicitation were considered in the past performance evaluation as recent performance. Relevance was assessed using the following definitions:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Very Relevant** | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same content, complexity, and size of effort this solicitation requires. |
| **Relevant** | Present/past performance effort involved much of the content, complexity,and size of effort this solicitation requires. |
| **Somewhat Relevant** | Present/past performance contractual effort involved some of the content, complexity, and size of effort this solicitation requires. |
| **Not Relevant** | Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the content, complexity, and size of effort this solicitation requires. |

The Government assessed the performance quality, schedule adherence, cost control, small business subcontracting, and safety performance of the contracts which were found to be recent and Relevant.

A performance confidence rating was assessed at the overall factor level for Past Performance after evaluating aspects of each offeror's recent and Relevant past performance. Each of the adjective ratings has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component. As used in these ratings, the term "pertinent" is equivalent to the term "Relevant." The Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings were assigned, in accordance with the RFP, as either Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, or Neutral.

## Evaluation of Proposals

After a preliminary review, all proposals were found to be acceptable and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors set out in the RFP. The results of the evaluation were presented to me and my senior officials on April 26, 2022. I made my award decision on May 3, 2022, after meaningful consideration of the information presented. I relied on the detailed information containing the SEB's Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price evaluation presentation, the backup documentation provided to me by the SEB, and my knowledge of NASA's overall and Program budgets.

### Team Axiom Space

**Price Factor** : The Government evaluated the proposed price. Axiom proposed a lower total evaluated price when compared to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

**Mission Suitability**
The evaluation of Axiom's proposal rated an overall score of 834 out of 1,000 points for the Mission Suitability Factor. The SEB identified two significant strengths, nine strengths, and three weaknesses in the proposal. There were no significant weaknesses assessed. The

following is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of Axiom's proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors:

**Technical Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor 1:** The Government evaluated Axiom's overall Technical Approach, Mission Suitability subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. As examples, Axiom provided a reasonable and feasible solution to provide key service capabilities that exceed some of the xEVAS requirements, including an appreciable greater number of ISS and Artemis EVAs per mission, increased number of crewmembers with flight hardware availability, and an increased number of suited and non-suited training runs. Furthermore, Axiom proposes a reasonable and feasible key design that includes features that exceed some of the xEVAS requirements, such as longer EVAs and increased emergency life support capabilities. Axiom received a rating of "Excellent" with one (1) Significant Strength, seven (7) Strengths and one (1) Weakness identified, attributing to a score of 644 points. There were no Significant Weaknesses or Deficiencies noted.

**Management Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor 2**: The Government evaluated Axiom's overall Management Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. By way of example, Axiom provided a reasonable and feasible Program Management plan that demonstrates a robust approach to risk management and systems engineering. In addition, Axiom's proposed Commercialization Approach demonstrates a close alignment between the xEVAS requirements and Axiom's commercial goals and objectives. Axiom received a rating of "Good" with two (2) Strengths and two (2) Weaknesses identified, attributing to a score of 140 points. There were no Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses or Deficiencies noted.

**Small Business Utilization, Mission Suitability Subfactor 3**: The Government evaluated Axiom's overall Small Business Utilization, Mission Suitability Subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP and evaluated Axiom's Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program. Small Businesses are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan but the evaluation of this factor applies to all Offerors. Axiom's proposal includes significant utilization of small business participation and demonstrates a commitment to providing small business opportunities to perform 'high technology' efforts. Axiom received a rating of "Excellent" with one (1) Significant Strength identified, attributing to a score of 50 points. There were no Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, or Deficiencies noted.

**Past Performance**: Team Axiom Space's (Axiom, KBR, David Clark Company, Air-Lock, Arrow Science and Technology, A-P-T Research, Inc., Paragon Space Development Corporation, and Sophic Synergistics) past performance evaluation determined that all contracts submitted in the proposal and all contracts included in the evaluation are Recent. Two submitted contracts were determined to be Relevant to the xEVAS effort while the third was determined to be Somewhat Relevant. An assessment was performed at the overall level in which the individual contract assessments were considered. As part of this assessment, the evaluation team found no evidence of past performance among any of Team Axiom Space's submitted past performance contracts related to the management of the Pressure Garment System (PGS) development and manufacturing that Axiom proposes KBR to perform under the xEVAS effort. This is a critical subsystem of any human-rated EVA system which requires highly specialized

skills to develop and manufacture. Team Axiom Space's past performance includes the development and demonstration of Offeror's crewed space system; however, the documented performance history at the time of this xEVAS evaluation only covers through the Preliminary Design Review phase of the development, which is very well short of the effort required under xEVAS to certify the system for NASA's use. As a result of the assessment, it was determined Team Axiom Space's past performance includes complexity and size that are much the same as the xEVAS effort and somewhat the same content. Therefore, the past performance for Team Axiom Space is rated as Relevant to the xEVAS effort. Team Axiom Space has Relevant past performance that is pertinent to the xEVAS effort and has demonstrated effective performance that was fully responsive to contract requirements. Collectively, Team Axiom Space's past performance record, including major subcontractors, demonstrates effective performance developing systems and providing services that are somewhat similar to the xEVAS effort in the manner of content, complexity, and size. While the documented record includes reportable problems, those issues have resulted in little identifiable effect on overall performance, as demonstrated in the ratings. Based on Team Axiom Space's performance record, there is a Moderate level of confidence that Team Axiom Space will successfully perform the required effort.

**Team Collins Aerospace**

**Price Factor**: The Government evaluated the proposed price. Collins proposed a slightly lower total evaluated price when compared to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

**Mission Suitability**
The evaluation of Collins' proposal rated an overall score of 829 out of 1,000 points for the Mission Suitability Factor. The SEB identified one significant strength, seven strengths, and one weakness in the proposal. There were no significant weaknesses assessed. The following is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of Collins' proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors:

**Technical Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor 1:** The Government evaluated Collins' overall Technical Approach, Mission Suitability subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. As an example, Collins provided reasonable and feasible key design features in their proposed EVA system that exceed some of the xEVAS requirements, providing mass savings, some removable components, extended quiescent stowage, and reduced EVA suit volume. In addition, Collins proposes reasonable and feasible Insight and Collaboration that combines organizational design and integrated digital data environments. Collins received a rating of "Excellent" with one (1) Significant Strength, four (4) Strengths and one (1) Weakness identified, attributing to a score of 637 points. There were no Significant Weaknesses or Deficiencies noted.

**Management Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor 2**: The Government evaluated Collins' overall Management Approach, Mission Suitability Subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP. For example, Collins provided a reasonable approach to ISS and Artemis development milestones by shifting the phasing of payments and altering milestones in a way that enhances Government insight while reducing early Government financial commitment.

In addition, Collins proposes a reasonable commercialization approach that demonstrates an understanding of NASA's goal to become one of many customers. Collins received a rating of "Good" with two (2) Strengths identified, attributing to a score of 160 points. There were no Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, or Deficiencies noted.

**Small Business Utilization, Mission Suitability Subfactor 3**: The Government evaluated Collins' overall Small Business Utilization, Mission Suitability Subfactor in accordance with the requirements of the RFP and evaluated Collins' Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program. Collins proposal demonstrates a commitment to small business by proposing to have several of their small business subcontractors perform 'high technology' efforts in support of the development of the proposed system. Collins received a rating of "Good" with one (1) Strength identified, attributing to a score of 32 points. There were no Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, or Deficiencies noted.

**Past Performance**: Team Collins Aerospace (ILC Dover; Oceaneering Space Systems; Blue Origin, LLC; MRI Technologies; Bastion Technologies; M&B Engineering; and Honeybee Robotics) past performance evaluation determined that all contracts included in the evaluation are Recent. All contracts submitted in the proposal as evidence of past performance were determined recent or to have overlapped with the recency period. One submitted contract was found to be Very Relevant to the xEVAS effort while the other two submitted contracts were determined to be Somewhat Relevant. An evaluation was performed at the overall level in which the individual contract assessments were considered. As a result of the assessment, it was determined Team Collins Aerospace's past performance includes content and complexity that are much the same as the xEVAS effort and essentially the same size. Therefore, the past performance for Team Collins Aerospace is rated Very Relevant to the xEVAS effort. The Relevant past performance is highly pertinent to the xEVAS effort and has demonstrated very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements. Collectively, the Offeror's past performance, including major subcontractors, demonstrates very effective performance in providing development of NASA systems and services that are essentially the same as the xEVAS effort in the manner of content, complexity, and size; however, the documented schedule performance includes minor problems that had little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, including an evaluation of and Relevant contracts, and performance, there is a high level of confidence the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort under xEVAS.

## Selection Decision

During the final evaluation presentation on April 26, 2022, I questioned the SEB on their evaluation and I carefully considered the material presented. I also requested and considered the comments of the senior officials who attended the briefing. The charts presented at the meeting did an excellent job of summarizing the SEB's evaluation of the proposals.

Prior to that meeting, I carefully examined the SEB's detailed findings report describing the Mission Suitability findings, together with the analysis of past performance evaluations and price analysis. As the Source Selection Authority (SSA), I examined the SEB's evaluation of each

factor and subfactor and I considered the evaluations of all the proposals. I found that the evaluation and findings are in accordance with the RFP and its evaluation criteria. I recognized the fact that it was my responsibility to make an independent judgment of the SEB's evaluation results and to determine if I agreed with that evaluation. I determined that the SEB had performed a careful and thorough job of evaluating both fully submitted proposals. They had done an excellent job documenting their evaluation, identifying and explaining the reasons for their findings of the strengths and weaknesses, past performance evaluations, and price analysis. The SEB provided detailed answers to the follow-up questions I had during the meeting. As SSA, I understand the merits, technical and otherwise, and the qualitative aspects of each proposal.

**Consideration of Individual Proposals**

**Team Axiom Space**

In considering each proposal individually, I find that Axiom's Mission Suitability has been evaluated as having two (2) Significant Strengths, nine (9) Strengths, and three (3) Weaknesses. There were no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies. I note that Axiom demonstrated an understanding of the dynamic nature of the various NASA programs and provides the flexibilities needed for the evolving NASA mission. The Axiom proposal provides increased duration of the Artemis mission EVA services period, significantly increasing flexibility in ISS and Artemis crew mission selection. Axiom also provides contingency crew swap scenarios by proposing EVA crew naming periods significantly closer to crew launch dates. By increasing the number of EVAs offered, Axiom's proposal allows NASA to perform more science and vehicle maintenance. In addition, Axiom's proposed increase in Artemis mission duration will allow longer surface sortie opportunities. Key system design features offer performance that increases crew efficiency with the potential to reduce crewmember fatigue and EVA preparation time. Axiom's proposal offers system performance that increases emergency life support capabilities. Axiom offers a hardware production plan that may reduce schedule risk by allowing for parallel testing activities and inventory that may mitigate unexpected harware anomalies. In addition, the Axiom proposal offers a core design with a very high commonality between ISS and Artemis configurations with options that allow for flexibility, enhancing the ability to upgrade and replace components, as needed. The Axiom proposal includes facility accomodations for NASA individuals to enhance insight and collaboration and also offers unlimited NASA personel access to Axiom's mission control center during real-time EVA operations. Axiom proposes to use nearly all of the NASA Standards and Specifications with minimal tailoring, helping to ensure that design, production, and testing methods match the NASA application approach. Axiom's proposal offers a strong Safety and Mission Assurance focus, increasing the likelihood of the provision of safe and reliable EVA services. Axiom's proposal provides details that demonstrate an understanding of many of their technical risks and proposes feasible mitigation strategies while offering a regular cadence of meetings, boards, and panels in alignment with NASA processes to provide effective and transparent communication with Government stakeholders. Axiom's approach includes the development of a robust commercialization plan and a detailed private investment strategy, evidenced by the private investment captured to date, as well as Axiom's ongoing work to build their own private low earth orbit space station. Furthmore, Axiom's proposal includes significant utilization of small

buiness participation in ‘high technology’ efforts. These aspects of Axiom’s proposal areseen as benefits to the Government.

However, I noted that certain aspects of Axiom’s proposal introduce some risk to successful contract performance. Specifically, Axiom’s proposal relies on rapid acceleration of technology maturation and resolution of key technical trade studies to achieve their proposed schedule for subCLIN 2A, Artemis EVA Demonstration. Further, Axiom’s commercialization approach includes assumptions with respect to revenue capture that could impact their ability to finance the xEVAS effort. Finally, Axiom’s proposed schedules for subCLIN 1A, ISS EVA Demonstration, and subCLIN 2A, Artemis EVA Demonstration, result in integration periods that elongate beyond the goals stated in the RFP, which increases the period of time until recurring services under xEVAS could begin.

In its Past Performance assessment, Team Axiom Space had some level of experience in many areas of the xEVAS SOW with its proposed subcontractor KBR having experience in many, but not all, aspects of the SOW. The SEB’s evaluation determined that Axiom and its team member KBR’s past performance contracts include complexity and size that are much the same as the xEVAS effort and somewhat the same content. I reviewed and agree with this evaluation. Overall, the Axiom Team’s past performance is rated Satisfactory. The one Axiom contract is rated Satisfactory. While the documented record includes reportable problems, those issues have resulted in little identifiable effect on overall performance under the contract, as demonstrated in the ratings. The two KBR contracts’ performance is rated Excellent. As the Offeror will be ultimately responsible for all aspects of performance under the xEVAS contract, the past performance of Axiom was weighted accordingly in the overall assessment. In considering Axiom’s Past Performance evaluation, I find Team Axiom Space’s overall past performance is Relevant to this acquisition and its Performance is Satisfactory, considering all the data, including the overall environmental rating of Very Good with no environmental citations in the last three years. In light of these factors, I have a Moderate level of confidence that Axiom will successfully perform the required effort.

Axiom’s proposed price was lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate.

## Team Collins Aerospace

I find that Collins’ Mission Suitability has been evaluated as having one (1) Significant Strength, seven (7) Strengths, and one (1) Weakness. There were no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies. Collins’ proposal offered key design features that significantly exceed some of the xEVAS requirements, including annual mass offerings well below the requirements for xEVAS maximum mass. Collectively, these proposed features enhance the potential for successful contract performance. Collins offers extensible system architecture with very high commonality between ISS and Artemis configurations and options for mission-specific configurations expected to support successful performance of the contract and reduce the Government’s technical, schedule, and cost risks. In addition, Collins’ approach offers Government and Contractor collaboration through a mix of organizational design and integrated digital data environments, simplifying access to data, offering accelerated approval processes, and demonstrating an understanding of the xEVAS requirement for insight and approval. The

Collins proposal offers early subjective evaluations of Pressure Garment System hardware to allow NASA to understand and provide feedback on the mobility capabilities early in the demonstration schedule. Collins' proposed approach to use nearly all of the NASA Standards and Specifications with minimal tailoring is anticipated to enhance successful performance of the contract by ensuring that design, production, and testing methods match NASA application approach for hardware reliability for critical human spaceflight activities. Collins' proposes milestones and phasing of contract payments that increase Government insight and reduce Government financial commitments made prior to in-space demonstration. Collins' commercialization approach demonstrates an understanding of NASA's goal to become one of many customers while providing a low-risk business approach that does not rely on private investments. In addition, Collins' proposal demonstrates a commitment to small businesses by proposing to have several of their small business subcontractors perform "high technology" efforts in support of the development of the proposed NextEVA system. These aspects of Collins' proposal are all seen as benefits to the Government.

However, I noted that certain aspects of Collins' proposal introduce some risk to successful contract performance. Specifically, Collins' proposal relies on rapid acceleration of technology maturation and resolution of key technical trade studies to achieve their proposed schedule for both subCLIN 1A, ISS EVA Demonstration, and subCLIN 2A, Artemis EVA Demonstration.

With respect to its Past Performance, Collins had much of the same experience in multiple areas of the xEVAS SOW and its proposed subcontractor, Oceaneering Space Systems had some level of experience in many areas of the SOW. Team Collins Aerospace's past performance contracts were reviewed and determined to include content and complexity that are much the same as the xEVAS effort and essentially the same size. I reviewed and agree with this evaluation. Overall Team Collins Aerospace is rated as High. The Collins Team's past performance is rated Excellent; however, the documented schedule performance includes minor problems that had little identifiable effect on overall performance. The three contracts offered for review demonstrate performance that is rated Excellent. The Safety, Health, and Environmental are rated Very Good. The Small Business Subcontracting is rated Excellent. An assessment was performed at the overall level in which the individual contracts' performance was considered. Therefore, I determine Team Collins Aerospace overall Performance to be Excellent. In light of these factors, I have a High level of confidence that Collins will successfully perform the required effort.

Collins' proposed price was slightly lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate.

**Comparison of Proposals**

In regards to RFP Evaluation Factors and Criteria:
***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.***

In looking at these three evaluation factors, Axiom has a slightly higher Mission Suitability score. Axiom has a Past Performance evaluation of Moderate Level of Confidence, which is

lower than Collins' confidence rating. Axiom also has a proposed price that is lower than Collins' proposed price.

Collins has the slightly lower Mission Suitability score, a Past Performance evaluation of High Level of Confidence, and the higher proposed price.

Both Offerors provided unique Strengths in their proposals and neither offeror presented a Significant Weakness. Both Offerors had at least one Weakness, but neither of the proposals included a Significant Weakness or a Deficiency. I appreciate both proposals that were compiled for NASA's consideration and am grateful for the robust contractor community that can offer its services and expertise to support our important mission directives. NASA benefits from the services offered and I am confident the competitive procurement process has challenged Offerors to refine their approaches and pricing to present NASA with proposals that will benefit our continuing work in Human Space Flight.

I appreciate the innovative approaches that each proposal presented, as outlined above, and I find that both offer appreciable value to NASA. Axiom offers a slightly higher Mission Suitability, the lower Past Performance rating, and the lower price. Collins offers a slightly lower Mission Suitability, the higher Past Performance rating, and the higher price. In this evaluation, 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. The RFP included 52.216-27 (OCT 1995) SINGLE OR MULTIPLE AWARDS by reference and I find that NASA's best interests are served by awarding multiple contracts in response to Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006 (xEVAS).

My selection determination for Axiom's proposal is based upon the results of my evaluation considered alongside the Government's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEB's evaluation of Axiom's proposal across the RFP's evaluation criterion, as well as the relative weightings of those criterion as stated herein. My analysis leads me to the conclusion that Axiom's proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Government, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in the RFP. Specifically, I conclude that the Moderate Past Performance and technical approach of Axiom's proposal provide value for NASA at its offered price.

For Mission Suitability, Axiom offered an Excellent Technical Approach, a Good Management Approach, and an Excellent Small Business Utilization. Axiom presented a proposal that evidenced understanding of the complexities and challenges of our intense mission environment, providing flexibilities and key system design features that I find will benefit NASA. While the SEB identified some risks associated with Axiom's proposal, I find the risks are similar to other complex system development efforts. These challenges are common in the dynamic environment of human spaceflight as well as in the evolving commercial space industry.

It is clear to me that our SEB scrutinized all aspects of the Offeror's proposal and presented findings reflecting all their concerns. However, it is important to note that none of the concerns were considered a Significant Weakness. In reading these findings and in discussions with the SEB, I have concluded that these potential issues are not significant and are likely to be addressed and resolved during contract administration. Given Axiom's overall proposal,

Mission Suitability offerings, significant commercial investment, and Moderate Past Performance, I am confident that any concerns will be answered and addressed during contract performance.

The SEB explained its rationale for giving Axiom a Moderate Level of Confidence rating in the area of Past Performance and I agree with this rating. As a whole, my analysis of the Axiom team's recent and Relevant past performance gives me confidence that the team is capable and possesses the necessary experience to perform the work under the xEVAS contract.

I also discussed the area of price for the Axiom proposal with the SEB. We discussed at length the SEB's price analysis and I understand that a price analysis was performed per FAR §15.404 and determined Axiom's price is fair and reasonable. Axiom's price is 23% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) and approximately 21% lower than Collins' price. I concur with the Contracting Officer's determination that Axiom's proposed price is fair and reasonable.

The amount of detail provided in Axiom's proposal clearly demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the work, the workforce, and safety issues under this contract and gives me confidence that Axiom can perform the work effectively. I therefore, determine that the Axiom proposal is a best value for the Government and I select them for an award under the Exploration Extravehicular Activity Services (xEVAS) Contract under Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006.

My selection determination for Collins' proposal stems from the results of my evaluation considered in light of the Government's currently available and anticipated future funding for this procurement. In making my selection, I examined the totality of the SEB's evaluation of Collins' proposal across the RFP's evaluation criterion, as well as the relative weightings of those criterion as stated herein. My analysis leads me to the conclusion that Collins' proposal is meritorious and advantageous to the Government, and that it aligns with the objectives as set forth in the RFP. Specifically, I conclude that the High Past Performance and technical approach of Collins' proposal provide value for NASA at its offered price.

For Mission Suitability, Collins offered an Excellent Technical Approach, Good Management Approach, and Good Small Business Utilization. Collins presented a proposal that evidenced understanding of the xEVAS requirements, the interconnected nature of NASA's programs, and the rapid tempo of NASA's operations. Collins' proposal provides key design features that significantly exceed some of the xEVAS requirements that I find will benefit NASA. While the SEB identified some risks associated with Collins' proposal, I find the risks are similar to other complex system development efforts that are common in the dynamic environment of human spaceflight.

It is clear to me that our SEB analyzed all aspects of the Offeror's proposal in detail and presented findings reflecting all their concerns. However, it is important to note that none of the concerns were considered a Significant Weakness. In reading these findings and in discussions with the SEB, I have concluded that the potential issue noted above are not significant and are likely to be addressed and resolved during contract administration. Given Collins' past performance efforts across many areas of the SOW and its Very Good to Exceptional past

performance efforts, I am confident that any concerns will be answered and addressed during contract performance.

The SEB explained its rationale for giving Collins a High Level of Confidence rating in the area of Past Performance and I agree with this rating. Based on my evaluation of the Collins team's recent and Relevant past performance, I have confidence that the team is capable and possesses the necessary experience to perform the work under the xEVAS contract.

I also discussed the area of price of the Collins' proposal with the SEB. We engaged in a detailed discussion about the SEB's price analysis and how a price analysis was performed per FAR §15.404 to determine that Collins' price is fair and reasonable. Collins' price was 2% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) and approximately 27% higher than Axiom's price. I concur with the Contracting Officer's determination that Collins' proposed price is fair and reasonable.

The details provided in Collins' proposal clearly demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the work, the workforce, and safety issues under this contract and gives me confidence that Collins can perform the work efficiently and effectively. Therefore, I determine that the Collins proposal is a best value for the Government and I select them for an award under the Exploration Extravehicular Activity Services (xEVAS) Contract under Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006.

In summation, I select both Team Axiom Space and Team Collins Aerospace for awards under the Exploration Extravehicular Activity Services (xEVAS) Contract under Solicitation Number 80JSC021R0006.

VANESSA WYCHE

Digitally signed by VANESSA WYCHE
Date: 2022.05.22 14:59:02 -05'00'

Vanessa Wyche
Source Selection Authority