

NRO Seeks Revolutionary Launch Ideas

December 18, 2000

The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) announced a Broad Agency Announcement today to fund research and technologies designed to advance state-of-the-art technologies and increase the knowledge of emerging launch technologies and techniques.

The NRO's Office of Space Launch, Advanced Programs Division is responsible for the Broad Agency Announcement. The Advanced Programs Division investigates and develops concepts and technologies that will enable the NRO to meet future launch needs.

"Our goal is to develop technologies that provide the best possible launch capabilities for our users when and where needed in the most cost effective manner," said Col. Stephen Wojcicki, director of the Office of Space Launch.

The period of performance for proposals submitted for this BAA may be up to a maximum of one year and the maximum price of any contract awarded will be limited to \$400,000 per contract.

More information on the BAA on next page.

COO/SL BAA for FY01

Revision 2
22 February 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

1. RESEARCH AREAS and OBJECTIVES

1.1 Web-Based Tools 2

1.2 Low-cost Space Technologies and Streamlined Design 2

Considerations for Payloads and Spacecraft

1.3 Risk Management and Mission Assurance 2

1.4 Standards and Best Practices 3

1.5 Operations 3

1.6 Advanced Launch Vehicle Technologies 3

1.7 Streamlined Launch Acquisitions 4

1.8 Tools for Launch Planning, Management and Operations 4

2. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION 5

2.1 Preparation

2.2 Preliminary Inquiries

2.3 Level Of Detail

2.4 Small Business Proposal

2.5 Eligibility

2.6 Post Employment Conflict Of Interest

2.7 Definitions

2.7.1 Small Business Concern

2.7.2 Small Disadvantaged Business Concern **6**

2.7.3 Permanent Equipment

2.8 Restrictive Marking On Proposals

2.8.1 Disclosure Limitations

2.8.2 Data Rights

2.8.3 Release Of Information

2.9 Report Requirements

2.10 Subcontracting **7**

2.11 Proposal Submission

2.11.1 Timeliness

2.11.2 Proposal for Continuation

2.11.3 Copies

3. CONTENTS OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL **7**

3.1 Proposal Guidance

3.2 Technical Content of Proposal

4. FINANCIAL **9**

5. PROPOSAL EVALUATION **10**

5.1 Criteria

5.1.1 Soundness of Technical/Management Approach/Understanding
the Problem

5.1.2 Related Experience (Contractor Qualifications)

5.1.3 Past Performance

5.2 Evaluation Procedure

5.3 Stand-Alone Evaluation

6. AWARD 11

7. ATTACHMENTS

1. Evaluation of Broad Agency Announcement

2. Policy Statement for Proposals from Offerors Seeking Research Contracts

INTRODUCTION

This is a Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) from the National Reconnaissance Office, Corporate Operations Office, Space Launch, Advanced Programs Division (APD). It is issued under the provisions of paragraph 6.102(d)(2) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), which provides for the competitive selection of research proposals. Contracts awarded as a result of proposals submitted in response to this BAA are considered to be the result of competition to the maximum extent practicable.

The NRO may contract with educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, and private industry for research in those areas covered in this BAA. The intent of the Advanced Programs Division is to investigate and develop concepts and technologies that will enable the NRO to meet future launch needs. Our goal is to develop technologies that provide the best possible launch capabilities for our users when and where needed in the most cost-effective manner. Specific research interests and objectives covered by this BAA are found in Section 1. Proposed research should investigate truly new and unique approaches and techniques that lead to, or enable revolutionary and evolutionary improvements in capability, performance, and cost.

Offerors may submit proposals on any topic either contained within this BAA or related to a BAA topic. Prior to submitting a proposal, offerors shall contact the technical points of contact, identified with the description of the corresponding research. Offerors are cautioned that only a Contracting Officer may obligate the Government to any agreement involving expenditure of Government funds.

The period of performance for proposals submitted in response to this BAA may be up to a maximum of one (1) year. Proposals shall contain a brief summary of the work and a ceiling rough order of magnitude (CROM) price spread by Government Fiscal Year (1 Oct – 30 Sep). It is the Government's intent to restrict the value of any contract awarded as a result of this BAA to a maximum price of \$400K per contract. Offerors are cautioned that award of any contract(s) pursuant to this BAA is subject to the availability of funds.

All written communications, including submission of proposals pursuant to this

BAA, shall be forwarded to the OSL Contracting Office Point of Contact, Mr. Merrill Huler, Contracting Officer, who can be reached at (310) 416-7497. Please call Mr. Huler only if you have questions of a contractual nature. Technical questions/comments should be directed to the technical points of contact listed in Section 1 herein.

SECTION 1 - RESEARCH INTERESTS: Specific technology areas of interest for this BAA are listed below:

1.1 Web Based Tools: We are seeking new methodologies, tools, and philosophies that could maximize reuse of documentation, analyses and procedures between contractors, subcontractors, government organizations, and site support organizations, as well as facilitate multiple site, real-time communications. They should allow the customer(s) end-to-end insight of the systems, including manufacturing, integration teams, quality/mission assurance teams, etc. Offerors should identify existing tools and interfaces that might be used in the paperless integration/manufacturing/data analysis arena.

Technical Point of Contact: Ms Pat Light (310) 416-7943

1.2 Low Cost Enabling Technologies and Streamlined Design Considerations for Payloads & Spacecraft: Small spacecraft and payloads are unable to find affordable access to space. All spacecraft and payloads are faced with integration on multiple launch systems with different interfaces to assure access to space. Offerors should identify solutions that would simplify the design and practice of integrating payloads with spacecraft and spacecraft with multiple launch vehicles. Offerors should consider approaches that would increase the manifesting opportunity of small payloads with spacecraft and spacecraft with multiple launch vehicles to achieve affordable access to space.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. James Liller (703) 808-2334

1.3 Risk Management and Mission Assurance: Risk mitigation is a key element in joint launch activities. For the purpose of this paragraph, joint launch activities include all joint satellite and launch system documentation, analysis, testing, and operations. Identification of risk and earlier development of mitigation plans has the potential for increasing reliability and decreasing total cost. Today's trend is to reduce integration time. Offerors should determine how to identify joint launch activity risks in a timely manner without placing a burden on either the satellite or launch system communities. Offerors should propose methods to identify and manage risk(s) to ensure the goal of increasing reliability and decreasing cost is achieved.

Mission Assurance is focused on the viability of a specific launch system to include hardware, software, processes, and operations. Offerors should identify methods to provide adequate information to assess a specific launch system for the purpose of mission assurance without unduly interfering with that launch system. Offerors should propose approaches to provide assurance of ever-increasing reliability of launch systems. Offerors should propose methods to identify and correct problems and/or quality escapements that can result in launch system production, testing and operational delays.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. Russ Cykoski (703) 808-4230

1.4 Standards and Best Practices. Develop a representative process flow and description for commercial and NRO launch integration. Identify areas to leverage "best practice" standards across the industry. Identify areas of the process flow for which single process initiatives might be applicable. Identify inhibitors to implementation of "best practices" and recommend solutions for overcoming these hindrances. Identify potential uses and existing databases and capabilities for 3D modeling, visualization, and walkthrough capabilities for vehicles and facilities. Identify Centers of Excellence for various capabilities across the industry (with associated POCs). Recommend methods for streamlining the launch integration acquisition process (such as acquiring integration services via on-line catalog). Offerors shall propose a process or forum for industry to adopt industry-wide standards and provide feedback from proposed participants on process phase-in.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. Dave Callen (703) 808-6502

1.5 Operations: All users need quick and cost effective processing on any given launch base. Offerors should recommend new spacecraft processing operations concepts based on one or more of the following: historical lessons learned, new technology developments, commercial practices, launch base facility utilization, cost saving measures, and/or international practices. Offerors could consider cost saving measures for the transition period between the heritage launch vehicle systems and the initial operational capability of EELV. Offerors could recommend new spacecraft design criteria that: 1) simplifies spacecraft processing at the launch base, 2) reduces mission risk during launch processing, and/or 3) is used on commercial satellites but not government.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. Bill Kaida (805) 605-8790

1.6 Advanced Launch Vehicle Technologies. All users need launch services that are highly reliable, less complex, easier to test, and cost effective. Offerors should identify advanced launch vehicle technologies and potential payoffs to improve expendable and/or reusable launch vehicles. Offerors should provide specific applications for the technologies identified. These applications range from the booster design, production processes, ground systems, testing, or operations. Offerors should include timelines and process for implementation.

Technical Point of Contact: Ms. Debbie Hathaway (703) 808-2633

1.7 Streamlined Launch Acquisitions. Develop a method to streamline the acquisition of launch services for the NRO. Consider the optimal solution for acquiring a launch service from the customer's perspective (where current thinking suggests a block buy concept is more cost effective). Address new and innovative procurement methods and contracting strategies, such as IDIQ type contracts (ordering from a catalog) where entrepreneurs can compete with well-developed companies. Investigate incentives, investment strategies, and cooperative partnerships. Suggest innovative partnerships and services. Address any necessary changes in the FAR or government process that would enable innovative, cost-effective launch solutions. For concepts of operation different than today's Expendable Launch Vehicle, recommend changes in the standard procurement strategy to take advantage of the new capabilities.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. Curtis Ellis (703) 808-2618

1.8 Tools for Launch Planning, Management and Operations. The NRO has identified several functional areas in which software tools are of high value in its launch planning, management, and operations activities. These areas include, but are not limited to: launch integration; real-time operations support, including automated data monitoring and space situational awareness (e.g., collision avoidance); launch base facility resource management; launch management training and rehearsals; data-centric, traceable test management; and facilitating design of spacecraft for EELV dual-compatibility. Enhancing collaboration amongst mission partners is a key objective that crosses all functional areas. Offerors should study and propose approaches for integrating COTS/GOTS (commercial/government off-the-shelf) tools to enhance the NRO's ability to plan, manage, and conduct launches. Offerors should define appropriate sets of tools within a single functional area or extending across multiple areas, identify potential synergies between these tools that would most benefit from multi-tool integration, and design appropriate interface standards to accomplish this integration. Development of new tools is not a goal of this study.

Technical Point of Contact: Mr. Ryan Noguchi (310) 416-7231

SECTION 2 - PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS:

2.1 Preparation. This section is intended to provide information needed to prepare research proposals for submission to the Advanced Programs Division (APD).

2.2 Preliminary Inquiries. Organizations or individuals interested in submitting research proposals to the APD shall first initiate a dialogue with the technical point of contact. The type of research effort contemplated should be understood and validated by the OSL technical representative prior to a potential offeror expending extensive time and effort preparing a detailed technical proposal. Proposals may be submitted anytime prior to the close date for each period set forth in paragraph 2.11.1, below. Proposal submissions shall be to the Contracting Officer as stated in paragraph 2.11.3 below.

2.3 Level of Detail. A formal proposal should present the proposed research effort in sufficient detail to allow the APD to evaluate the scientific/technical merit and relevance of the proposed research. Proposals shall not exceed 20 pages without prior Government approval.

2.4 Small Business Proposal. The APD encourages all contractors/organizations, including small business and small disadvantaged business concerns to submit research proposals for consideration. No awards will be set aside for small and small disadvantaged business concerns.

2.5 Eligibility. To be eligible for award of a contract, a prospective offeror must meet certain minimum standards including financial resources, ability to comply with performance schedules, prior record of performance, integrity, organization, experience, operational control, technical skills, facilities and equipment required for performance of the work proposed.

2.6 Post Employment Conflict of Interest. There are certain post employment restrictions on former federal officers and employees, including special government employees (section 207 of Title 18, United States Code (USC)). If a prospective offeror believes a Conflict of Interest may exist, the situation should be discussed with the Contracting Office and legal personnel prior to expending time and effort in preparing a proposal.

2.7 Definitions:

2.7.1 Small Business Concern. A small business concern, including its affiliates, that is independently owned and operated, not dominant in the field of operation in which it is bidding on Government contracts and qualified as a small business under the criteria and size standards in 13 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) part 121.

2.7.2 Small Disadvantaged Business Concern. A small business concern is (a) at least 51 percent unconditionally owned by one or more individuals who are both socially and economically disadvantaged, or publicly owned business having at least 51 percent of its stock unconditionally owned by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged individuals and (b) has its management and daily business controlled by one or more such individuals.

2.7.3 Permanent Equipment. Permanent equipment is any article of nonexpendable tangible personal property having a useful life of more than two years, and an acquisition cost of \$500 or more per unit.

2.8 Restrictive Marking On Proposals

2.8.1 Disclosure Limitations. All proposals should clearly indicate any limitations on the disclosure of proprietary information. (See Attachment 2.) Contractors should complete the Research Proposal Cover Page in accordance with FAR 15.609 indicating their preference for release of information contained in proposals. **Offerors are hereby notified that the Government intends to utilize a Peer and Scientific Evaluation Team (PSET), and a Prioritization Integrated Product Team (PIPT) in determining which initiatives should be funded. The PSET will consist of Government, Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), and Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance (SETA) Contractors. The PSET will be used in the proposal evaluation process. The PIPT will consist of Government, Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance (SETA) Contractors, and Commercial Contractor personnel. The PIPT will be used to prioritize research initiatives for funding.** All personnel assigned to both teams will sign a Nondisclosure Form and will be made aware that proposals shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed in whole or in part for any purpose other than to evaluate the proposal. **Any offeror who states in writing that they are unwilling to allow contractor members of the PSET or PIPT to review their proposal shall have their proposal returned without evaluation.**

2.8.2 Data rights. Records or data bearing a restrictive legend may be included in the proposal. Any proprietary data that the offeror intends to be used by the APD for evaluation purposes must be identified. The offeror must also identify in its proposal any technical data or other deliverables that will be delivered to the Government with less than unlimited rights.

2.8.3 Release of Information. The Offeror is cautioned, however, that portions of the proposal may be subject to release under the terms of The Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552, As Amended.

2.9 **Report Requirements**. The APD requires the delivery of a final report and briefing at the conclusion of each contract notwithstanding the fact that the research may be continued under a follow-on contract. The final briefing shall be accomplished at NRO Headquarters, Chantilly,

VA. The number and types of other reports may be proposed by the offeror. Interim reports will be prepared and submitted in accordance with requirements mutually agreed to and negotiated and as part of a definitive contract. All final reports shall be submitted in paper and soft copy.

2.10 Subcontracting. Pursuant to Section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 USC 637 (d)), it is the policy of the government to enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as prime contractors or subcontractors under Government contracts. Prime contractors and subcontractors are to carry out this policy to the maximum extent possible.

2.11 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

2.11.1 Timeliness. Proposals may be submitted at any time; however, the Government intends to evaluate proposals at regular intervals. All proposals received prior to 9 April 01 will be evaluated. To avoid delays in evaluation, all proposals must be prepared in accordance with the instructions included in this BAA. All proposals submitted under this BAA shall have an effective period not less than 120 days from the proposal date.

2.11.2 Proposal for Continuation. A proposal for continuation of a given research project will be considered on the same basis as proposals for new research agreements. The proposal should be submitted sufficiently in advance of the expiration of the existing agreement so that if it is accepted, that support may be continued without interruption.

2.11.3 Copies. Submittal of five (5) copies of the proposal will expedite the evaluation process. Each copy must contain any applicable restrictive legends (see above). The mailing envelope as well as the cover of the proposal will be marked with "In Response to APD BAA for 2001." Copy one (1), the original, proposal shall be submitted to Office of Space Launch, ATTN: SAF/SL (M. Huler), 2420 Vela Way, Suite 1467-A5, Los Angeles AFB, El Segundo, CA 90245-4659. Copies two (2) through five (5), and the electronic submission discussed in paragraph 2.1.1.4 shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) Maj. Angela Burns, National Reconnaissance Office, 14675 Lee Road, Suite 14F04E, Chantilly, VA 20151-1715.

2.1.1.4 Electronic Submission. Offerors shall submit one (1) softcopy of the executive summary of each proposal. Use of the softcopy will reduce the amount of time and effort needed by the Government to indoctrinate the PIPT on concepts it will help prioritize. The executive summary shall include a title and an abstract of the statement of work (SOW) and basic approach(es) to be used. Offerors shall submit executive summaries using Microsoft Word 2000. Use of other application software for submission of proposal data is prohibited.

SECTION 3 - CONTENTS OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL:

3.1 Proposal Guidance. The guidance set forth in the following paragraphs applies to all proposal submissions, except where specifically noted. Any proprietary data that the offeror intends for the APD to use for evaluation purposes must be specifically identified in the proposal. **(Please see paragraph 2.8.1 above)**

3.2 Technical Content of Proposal. The technical portion of the proposal shall comply with the following:

3.2.1 Executive Summary. Include an executive summary consisting of title and an abstract of the statement of work (SOW) and basic approach(es) to be used on a separate page.

3.2.2 Statement of Work (SOW). The technical proposal shall include a SOW detailing the technical tasks to be accomplished under the proposed effort and be suitable for incorporation into any contract that may result. Identify in the SOW the effort intended for each Government Fiscal Year (1 Oct – 30 Sep).

3.2.3 Background and Objectives. Include in the basic proposal a reasonably complete discussion stating the background and objectives of the proposed work, the approaches to be considered, and the level of effort to be employed. Identify the nature and extent of the anticipated results, and, if known, the manner in which the work will contribute to the accomplishment of the APD intent.

3.2.4 Summary of Key Personnel. Provide the names and brief biography of the offeror's key personnel to be involved in the research. Provide documentation of previous work or experience in the field of the proposal and identify published work(s) by the key personnel.

3.2.5 Sponsor-Provided Support. Identify the type of support, if any, the offeror requests of the APD, such as information, equipment, or materials.

6. Environmental Impact. Make a statement regarding possible impact, if any, of the proposal's effect on the environment. If none, so state.

3.2.7 Required Facilities. Identify the facilities to be used for the work. Provide the detail appropriate for understanding the proposal.

3.2.8 Past Performance. Each offeror will be evaluated on its past performance. Past performance is defined to include the offeror's performance on completed and current contracts. The Government will focus on information that demonstrates quality of performance relative to the size and complexity of the research item under consideration. Offerors shall submit information (contract number, point of contact, and telephone number for each) on the last three (3) most relevant contracts and/or subcontracts completed during the past three (3) years. "Relevant contracts" are defined as those efforts performed by your company that have demonstrated your ability to successfully perform the technical requirements of your proposed research topic.

3.2.9 Page Limitation. The technical proposal shall be limited to 20 pages (12 pitch or larger type), single spaced, double-sided, 8.5 by 11-inch pages. The page limitation excludes blank pages, title pages, tables of contents, acronym lists, tabs or cover sheets, and lists of illustrations only. Those pages not in the page count may not contain information needed for evaluating the proposal. Each printed side counts as one page. **The Government will not consider pages submitted in excess of this limitation.**

3.2.10 Memorandum of Understanding. Complete the enclosed Memorandum of Understanding (Attachment 1) thereby acknowledging the APD policy of evaluation of proposals in response to BAA. This Memorandum of Understanding does not count against the 20-page limit as stated above.

SECTION 4 - FINANCIAL: Provide a ceiling rough order of magnitude (CROM). This CROM shall state the upper limit for which the effort proposed will cost the Government. Delineate the CROM project costs for each Government Fiscal Year of the program. A detailed cost proposal to support the technical proposal bounded by the CROM shall only be submitted at the written request of the cognizant Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO). Upon receipt of the detailed cost proposal the Government will perform an evaluation of cost realism and reasonableness.

SECTION 5 - PROPOSAL EVALUATION:

5.1 Evaluation Criteria. The objective of the evaluation is to identify offerors who will provide the greatest satisfaction of requirements/objectives within funding limitations. Proposals submitted in response to this BAA will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria, which are listed in descending order of importance:

5.1.1 Soundness of Technical/Management Approach: The objective of this criterion is to establish the technical worthiness of the proposed effort. Items to be considered include technical and management approach toward achieving the stated objective(s), existence of sufficient technical payoff to warrant risk, and long term affects of this research including potential for revolutionary and evolutionary development.

5.1.2 Understanding the Problem: The proposal will be evaluated to determine if it addresses a specific research area as identified in this BAA, and determine if the proposed research could completely or partially satisfy the need(s) set forth in Section 1 of this BAA. This criterion does not address the soundness of the technical/management approach. Considerations include problem comprehension, and the degree to which the proposed solution(s), if successful, will satisfy the research needs.

5.1.3 Related Experience (Contractor Qualifications): The objective of this criterion is to establish that the offeror has credible capability and has had sufficient experience to complete the proposed work. Technical milestones and level of planning at each stage of the project must be appropriate to the proposed research.

5.1.4 Past Performance: The objective of this criterion is to establish that the offeror delivers quality products meeting all contract requirements, performs to schedules, meets interim milestones and completes projects within budget. Effective management that exhibits flexibility and concern for government interests will also be evaluated. Contractors will be required to provide references on past performance. The Government will use the information provided as well as past performance on other OSL contracts in evaluating past performance.

5.2 Evaluation Procedure. Offerors shall discuss submitting a proposal with the cognizant Technical Point of Contact, set forth in Section 2 of this BAA, before submitting a proposal. Offerors are advised that the Government will not pay for the preparation of a proposal, nor does proposal submission mean that the Government will award a contract. Upon receipt of a proposal, using the criteria outlined below, the Peer and Scientific Evaluation Team (PSET) shall perform initial evaluations of proposals and determine the scientific and/or technical merit and

potential contribution to the NRO mission. Proposals without adequate scientific or technical merit shall be identified and immediately rejected by the Selection Authority (SA), and the Contracting Office will inform the offeror. All remaining proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the following steps:

5.2.1. Each PSET member will fully review all remaining proposals and perform a complete evaluation. Contractors may be contacted and discussions may occur as necessary to further determine acceptability according to evaluation criteria.

5.2.2. PSET members will use the criteria contained in Paragraph 5.1 of this BAA to evaluate the proposals. The criteria items will be rated from 0-10, multiplied by the percent weight factor (expressed as a fraction from 0.00 to 1.00), summed, and multiplied by ten to produce a score from 0.0 to 100.0.

5.2.3. PSET members will then meet to discuss their evaluations. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that each evaluator has adequately considered the possible strengths and weaknesses of the proposal(s).

5.2.4. The Government PSET members will then prepare final scorings, select proposals for award and submit them to the PSET Chairman.

5. The PSET Chairman will consolidate quantitative evaluation results and draft a Proposal Analysis Report (PAR). The PAR documents the evaluation of the proposal against the evaluation criteria. The PSET Chairperson will then prepare the Selection Decision Document and call a meeting of the Prioritization Integrated Product Team (PIPT).

5.2.6. The PIPT will consider the quantitative results as identified and briefed by the PSET Chairperson. The PIPT will then consider the potential for commercial application and the benefits expected to accrue from this commercialization. The PIPT will be comprised of senior Government, FFRDC, SETA, and commercial contractors. Topics will be prioritized on the following basis, in descending order: technical merit, and benefit to the overall launch community. Research items with a high ranking may result in contract award based upon the evaluation criteria established above and the availability of funds.

Note: The APD will evaluate proposals based on the merit and relevance of the specific research proposed as it relates to the overall APD research objectives, rather than against other proposals for the research in the same general area.

SECTION 6 - AWARD: Based upon the criteria identified above, the APD may award single or multiple firm fixed price contracts in accordance with technical priority and funding availability. Further, the Government reserves the right to award no contracts resulting from proposals submitted in accordance with this BAA.

Prior to acceptance of any article of equipment, material, or disclosure of information for evaluation or testing by the Space Launch, Advanced Programs Division (APD), the following policy must be understood and agreed to by the individual, firm, or corporation submitting such products.

POLICY

1. APD has a continuing interest in receiving and evaluating proposals containing new ideas, suggestions, and inventive concepts for launch systems, supplies, facilities, devices and equipment. However, Government personnel and contractors are constantly engaged in research and development activities. Consequently, the substance of a submitted proposal may already be known to Government employees, contractors, or may even be in the public domain. Therefore, it is desirable, when receiving proposals for evaluation, to insure that the entities submitting proposals are aware of the conditions under which they will be considered by APD.
2. It should be understood that the receipt and evaluation of the proposals by APD does not imply a promise to pay, a recognition of novelty or originality, or any relationship which might require the Government to pay for the use of information to which it is otherwise lawfully entitled.
3. APD will exercise care in accordance with the normal safeguarding of procurement information to ensure that, in addition to technical design or concept data submitted, financial and management plans will not be used by the Government for any purpose other than evaluation of the proposal.
4. The voluntary submission will be handled, as stated, in accordance with established Government procedures for safeguarding such articles or information against unauthorized disclosure. In addition, the data forming a part of or constituting the submission will not be disclosed outside the Government or be duplicated, used, or disclosed in whole or in part by the Government, except for Government use purposes to evaluate the proposal. This restriction extends to, and includes financial and management plan information submitted with, or forming a part of the proposal. This restriction does not limit the Government's right to use information contained in such data if it is obtained from another source, or is in the public domain.
5. Letters notifying offerors of APD 's decision to accept or reject their proposal will be sent via regular U.S. mail to offerors after the evaluation of their proposal has been completed, or upon the decision that funding will not be available. Debriefings will not be given.
6. Offerors will submit the following certification with their proposal, certifying their understanding of the above information:

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The undersigned who has read and understand the above policy, on behalf of (Name of the Individual, Company or Corporation)

has made a disclosure of a proposal to OSL/APD relating to the research area of

It is understood that APD has accepted the above proposal for the purpose of evaluating it and advising of any possible APD interest. It is further understood that such acceptance does not imply or create: a promise to pay, an obligation to give up any legal right or to assume any duty; a recognition of novelty, originality, or priority; or any relationship, contractual or otherwise, such as would render the Government liable to pay for or to give up any legal right or assume any obligation for disclosure or use of any information in the proposal to which the Government would otherwise be lawfully entitled.

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

PRINTED/TYPED NAME: _____

TITLE/POSITION: _____

REFERENCE OSL/APD BAA # _____

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: _____

Attachment 2

POLICY STATEMENT FOR PROPOSALS FROM OFFERORS SEEKING RESEARCH CONTRACTS

It is the policy of the Space Launch, Advanced Programs Division (APD) to treat all proposals as privileged information before award and to disclose the contents only for purposes of evaluation. Technical evaluations of these proposals are made by highly qualified personnel. Offerors are hereby notified that the Government intends to utilize a Prioritization Integrated Product Team (PIPT) consisting of Government, Federally Funded Research and Development Center

(FFRDC), Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance (SETA) Contractors, and Commercial Contractor personnel in determining which initiatives should be funded.

All evaluators and PIPT members sign Nondisclosure Forms and are made aware that proposals shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed in whole or part for any purpose other than to evaluate the proposal, without the written permission of the offeror.

Despite internal controls, release of proposal information may be protected from outside sources only to the extent that the proposal is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

Please complete the following statement indicating your preference for treatment of your disclosure:

STATEMENT OF DISCLOSURE PREFERENCE

(Name of Company or Institution) in submitting proposal (Title/Name or Number of Proposal) with (Name of Principal Investigator/Program Manager or Corporation or Institution Authorized Signature Representative) requires the following procedure to be used during the evaluation of the proposal:

The data contained in this research proposal shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed in whole or in part for any purpose, other than to evaluate the proposal, without the written permission of the offeror (except that if a contract is awarded on the basis of this proposal, the terms of the contract shall control disclosure and use). This restriction does not limit the Government's right to use information contained in the proposal if it is obtainable from another source without restriction.

Permission is hereby granted to the Space Launch, Advanced Programs Division (APD) to evaluate this proposal, which may include the evaluation by evaluators both within and outside the Government, with the understanding that a written agreement not to disclose this information shall be obtained from all evaluators.

The proposal shall be marked in accordance with FAR 15.609.

(Date) (Signature of Authorized Representative)

(Date) (Signature of Principal Investigator or Program Manager)