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BACKGROUND

• MOL SSSB ORIGINALLY ESTABLISHED PER
  AFSC MESSAGE MSF 1-9-6-1, DATED 9 JUNE 1964, AND
  SSD SPECIAL ORDER NO. M-290, DATED 31 AUGUST 1964

• ORIGINAL BOARD CONVENE AT SSD DURING THE PERIODS:
  1-2 SEPTEMBER 1964
  29-30 SEPTEMBER 1964
  19-21 OCTOBER 1964

• ACTIONS ACCOMPLISHED
  • REVIEWED DRAFT RFP
  • ESTABLISHED GENERAL & SPECIFIC CRITERIA
  • DEVELOPED BIDDER'S LIST
  • ORGANIZED & STAFFED EVALUATION GROUP
  • PREPARED EVALUATION CRITERIA
MOL PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

(DR. BROWN MEMO - 4 JANUARY 1965)

**PRIMARY OBJECTIVES:**

A. DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY CONTRIBUTING TO IMPROVED MILITARY OBSERVATIONAL CAPABILITY – MANNED OR UNMANNED

B. DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF MANNED ASSEMBLY AND SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES IN ORBIT WITH POTENTIAL MILITARY APPLICATION

C. OTHER MANNED MILITARY EXPERIMENTATION

**ADDITIONAL NATIONAL OBJECTIVES:**

A. BASIC SCIENTIFIC AND GENERAL TECHNOLOGICAL MANNED EXPERIMENTATION

B. DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF MANNED ASSEMBLY AND SERVICE OF LARGE NONMILITARY STRUCTURES IN ORBIT

C. BIOLOGICAL RESPONSES OF MAN IN ORBIT FOR 30 DAYS OR MORE
DIRECTED ACTIONS

FROM DR. BROWN'S MEMO TO SAFUS—4 JANUARY 1965

A. DEFINE AN EXPERIMENTAL MILITARY PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES FOR:
   • IMPROVED MILITARY OBSERVATIONAL CAPABILITY
   • DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION OF MANNED ASSEMBLY & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES IN ORBIT

B. DETERMINE ESSENTIAL VEHICLE CHARACTERISTICS REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THE ABOVE

C. ASSESS PROPOSED SPECIFICATIONS OF THE GEMINI B PLUS LABORATORY CONFIGURATION, EMPLOYING LAUNCH CAPABILITIES OF TITAN III-C AGAINST NEEDS CITED ABOVE

D. EXAMINE APPROVED CONFIGS OF THE APOLLO SYSTEM TO DETERMINE EXTENT TO WHICH ANY OF THESE COULD MEET MILITARY NEEDS IN A MORE EFFICIENT, LESS COSTLY OR MORE TIMELY FASHION

E. SUBMIT REVIEW BY 15 MAY 1965
### MOL Related Activities

#### 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROPOSAL PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOURCE SELECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREPARATION OF DESIGN STUDIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREPARATION OF PIDD</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOURCE SELECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>NASAs STUDY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUBSYSTEM STUDIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>NASA STUDY</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUNE

- **25** DDR & E MEMO
- **15** PROPOSAL PREPARATION
- **15** SOURCE SELECTION

**Special Access Required**

**Secret**

This document contains information regarding the development of the MOL project. The MOL project is expected to utilize the latest advancements in technology to achieve its goals. The project team is working diligently to ensure the successful completion of the project in the specified timeline.
RECONSTITUTED MOL S S S B

- BOARD RECONSTITUTED PER -
  AFSC MESSAGE SCG 13641 DATED 10 FEB 65
  AND SSD SPECIAL ORDER M-50, DATED 15 FEB 65

- RECONSTITUTED BOARD CONVENED AT SSD —
  29 JAN 65
  10-12 FEB 65
  17-19 FEB 65
  23-24 FEB 65

- ACTIONS ACCOMPLISHED:
  — REORGANIZED EVALUATION GROUP
  — REVISED EVALUATION CRITERIA
  — ESTABLISHED WEIGHTING FACTORS
  — EVALUATED CONTRACTORS' PROPOSALS
  — RECOMMENDED THREE CONTRACTORS
    FOR MOL PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDY
BIDDING CONTRACTORS

- THE BOEING COMPANY
- DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT COMPANY, INC.
- GENERAL DYNAMICS CORPORATION
- GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
- LOCKHEED CORPORATION
- MARTIN COMPANY
- NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION CORP.
DESIGN STUDY CONTRACTORS

• THE BOEING CO.
• DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO.
• GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.
• LOCKHEED MISSILES & SPACE CO.
CONTINUATION OF MOL SSSB

• CONTINUATION OF MOL SSSB DIRECTED PER AFSC CONFIDENTIAL TWX MSF-1 17935 DATED 26 MAR 65, AND SSG LETTER DATED 15 APR 65, SUBJECT: MOL SYSTEM SOURCE SELECTION BOARD

• BOARD RECONVENED AT SSD:
  
  16 APR 65
  23 APR 65
  26-27 APR 65
  13-14 MAY 65
  21 MAY 65

• ACTIONS ACCOMPLISHED:
  • REORGANIZED EVALUATION GROUP
  • REVISED EVALUATION CRITERIA
  • ESTABLISHED WEIGHTING FACTORS
  • EVALUATED PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDIES
  • RECOMMENDED ONE CONTRACTOR FOR PROJECT DEFINITION PHASE
MOL SYSTEM SOURCE
SELECTION BOARD MEMBERSHIP

BRIGADIER GENERAL JEWELL C. MAXWELL — CHAIRMAN

COLONEL RUSSELL A. BERG — MEMBER

COLONEL DAVID L. CARTER — MEMBER

COLONEL JAMES J. McMAHON* — MEMBER

MR. EUGENE S. SILBERMAN** — MEMBER

MAJOR JULIAN E. JAKES — RECORDER

*VICE COLONEL RODNEY NUDENBERG
**VICE MR. CLAUDE T. GIBSON
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# MOL SSSB Schedule

## 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-17 April</td>
<td>SSSB Reconvened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 April</td>
<td>SSSB Briefing to SAfUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Apr - 1 May</td>
<td>Eval Group Weights to SSSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8 May</td>
<td>Design Studies Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15 May</td>
<td>SPO Review of Design Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-22 May</td>
<td>Eval Group Convened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29 May</td>
<td>Contractor Oral Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>Eval Group Report to SSSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation to SSD Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation to AFS Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation to Air Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation to MOL Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL ASPECTS

• DEVIATION FROM STANDARD BOARD COMPOSITION

• CONTINUATION FROM PREVIOUS BOARD ACTIVITIES

• CONCURRENT USE OF REPORTS FOR PREPARATION OF MOL PTDP & SOURCE SELECTION

• RELATED EFFORT

• SCHEDULE
EVALUATION GROUP
PROCEEDINGS
AND RESULTS
MOL OBJECTIVES
(PER WS)

● DEVELOP TECHNIQUES TO IMPROVE CAPABILITIES FOR MANNED AND UNMANNED OPERATIONS OF MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE. TO INCLUDE INTERMEDIATE STEPS TOWARD OPERATIONAL SYS.

● DEVELOP AND DEMONSTRATE-
  ● MANNED ASSEMBLY
  ● SERVICE
  ● TEST OF LARGE STRUCTURES (TELESCOPES AND ANTENNAE) FOR POTENTIAL MILITARY USE.

● CONDUCT OTHER MANNED MILITARY EXPERIMENTS AS LISTED.

● ACCOMPLISH KEY SCIENTIFIC EARTH-ORBIT EXPERIMENTS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.
THE CONTRACTORS TASKS (PER WS)

1. ASSEMBLY, TEST, OPERATION, & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES IN ORBIT
   - INTEGRAL LAUNCH
   - NON-INTEGRAL LAUNCH

2. ORBITING VEHICLE ANALYSIS & DEFINITION
   - INTEGRAL LAUNCH INITIALLY
   - MODIFIED ARRANGEMENT LATER

3. LABORATORY VEHICLE SYSTEM ANALYSIS
   - MAJOR ELEMENTS
   - SUBSYSTEMS
   - CREW PROVISIONS
   - HUMAN FACTORS
   - FINALIZE MOL PRELIMINARY SYSTEM PERFORMANCE/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATIONS.

4. EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATIONS

5. PROGRAM PLANNING
   - PDP
   - ACQUISITION

SSG-65-12
BASIS OF EVALUATION
(SSHKM LETTER OF 8 APR. 1965)

- TECHNICAL
  UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM
  TECHNICAL APPROACH
  COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS
  SPECIAL FACTORS — UNIQUE IDEAS

- MANAGEMENT
  OVER-ALL MANAGEMENT APPROACH
  RESOURCES & ORGANIZATION
  INTEGRATION PLANNING
  PROGRAM PLANNING
  SCHEDULING
  MANAGEMENT & FINANCIAL CONTROLS

- COST
  REALISTIC COST ESTIMATES
  TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS
  REALISTIC BUDGETING
  SUPPORTING DATA
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CONTRACTOR FINAL REPORT ORGANIZATION
(PER PCO LTR OF 8 APR 65)

VOL I - TECHNICAL

TASK I - LARGE STRUCTURES
TASK II - ORBITING VEHICLE ANALYSIS
TASK III - LABORATORY VEHICLE ANALYSIS
    MAJOR ELEMENTS AND SUBSYSTEMS
    CREW PROVISIONS AND HUMAN FACTORS
TASK IV - EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION

VOL II - PRELIMINARY PROGRAM PLAN - TASK IV LESS COST

VOL III - COST DATA
SSSB EVALUATION CRITERIA

- GENERAL
  - CORRECTION POTENTIAL

- TECHNICAL
  - SYSTEM ANALYSIS
    - FLEXIBILITY
    - GROWTH
    - INTERFACES
    - INTEGRATION
  - CREW CONSIDERATIONS
    - SUSTENANCE
    - CREW INTEGRATION
    - HEALTH & SAFETY
    - E.V. CAPABILITY
    - ESCAPE
  - VEHICLE ELEMENTS
    - STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY
    - DYNAMICS
    - SUB-SYSTEM INTEGRATION
  - EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION
    - FLEXIBILITY
  - LARGE STRUCTURES
    - STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY
    - DYNAMICS
    - TEST, CHECKOUT & SERVICING
SSSB EVALUATION CRITERIA (CONT'D)

- MANAGEMENT
  - ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES
    - PROGRAM ORGANIZATION
    - EXPERIENCE & BACKGROUND
  - PROGRAM CONTROL
    - SCHEDULE & FISCAL

- COST
  - METHODOLOGY
  - COMPLETENESS, REALISM & VALIDITY
  - COST CONTROL
  - COST DEFICIENCIES
  - EXPENDITURE
  - FACILITIES & EQUIPMENT
  - PROFIT PATTERNS

- PROGRAM PLANNING
  - TIME PHASING
  - MANPOWER BUILDUP
EVALUATION GROUP EXPERIENCE

- Average Years Government Service: 19.8
- Average Years Research and Development Experience: 9.4
- SPO Experience: 58%
- Procurement Experience: 47%

- Highest Educational Level Completed:
  - Doctor: 14%
  - Master: 35%
  - Bachelor: 41%
EVALUATION GROUP FUNCTIONS

- Develop detailed criteria
- Establish evaluation group weights
- Secure SSSB approval of rating system
- Receive & evaluate design studies using approved rating system
- Arrange for contractor presentations
- Present evaluation results & rating of contractors to SSB
WHAT WAS EVALUATED?

PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDIES
WEIGHTING CONSIDERATIONS

- TASK COMPLEXITY
- MAGNITUDE OF TASK
- SIGNIFICANCE OF TASK
- STATE-OF-THE-ART
# EVALUATION WEIGHTS

## 1.0 TECHNICAL AREA

### 1.1 ASSEMBLY & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES
- **1.1.1 Vehicle Interface**
- **1.1.2 Design Configuration**
- **1.1.3 Environmental Considerations**

### 1.2 ORBITING VEHICLE
- **1.2.1 Mission Analysis**
- **1.2.2 Orbiting Vehicle Integration**
- **1.2.3 Operational Potential**

### 1.3 LABORATORY VEHICLE
- **1.3.1 Laboratory System Integration**
- **1.3.2 Laboratory Configuration**
- **1.3.3 Aerospace Ground Equipment**
- **1.3.4 Development Testing**

### 1.4 CREW PROVISIONS & HUMAN FACTORS
- **1.4.1 Crew Health and Safety**
- **1.4.2 Human Engineering**
- **1.4.3 Crew Utilization**

### 1.5 EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION
- **1.5.1 Payload Definition**
- **1.5.2 Payload Integration**
- **1.5.3 Test and Operations**
- **1.5.4 Growth and Flexibility**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly &amp; Service of Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures 1.1 Vehicle Interface</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Design Configuration</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Environmental Considerations</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbiting Vehicle 1.2 Mission</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis 1.2.1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbiting Vehicle Integration</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Operational Potential</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Vehicle 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Integration 1.3.1</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration 1.3.2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Ground Equipment 1.3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Testing 1.3.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Provisions 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety 1.4.1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Engineering 1.4.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Utilization 1.4.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments Accommodation 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload Definition 1.5.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payload Integration 1.5.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Operations 1.5.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Flexibility 1.5.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# EVALUATION WEIGHTS (CONT'D)

## 2.0 MANAGEMENT AREA

2.1 ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES
   - 2.1.1 ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT
   - 2.1.2 EXPERIENCE (COMPANY)
   - 2.1.3 SUBCONTRACTING

2.2 PROGRAM PLANNING
   - 2.2.1 PHASE I PLAN
   - 2.2.2 PHASE II PLAN

2.3 PROGRAM CONTROL
   - 2.3.1 SCHEDULE CONTROL
   - 2.3.2 CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT

## 3.0 COST METHODOLOGY & CONTROL

3.1 COST CONTROL & ANALYSIS
   - 3.1.1 ESTIMATE ANALYSIS
   - 3.1.2 RESEARCH & PRODUCTION PROPERTY, EQUIPMENT & ASSOCIATE CONTRACTOR SUPPORT SERVICES
   - 3.1.3 COST CONTROL
   - 3.1.4 INCENTIVES AND PROFIT

3.2 COST METHODOLOGY
   - 3.2.1 COST ESTIMATE
   - 3.2.2 METHODOLOGY OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
EVALUATION TECHNIQUE

3 AREAS & 3 PANELS

1.0 TECHNICAL

2.0 MANAGEMENT

3.0 COST METHODOLOGY & CONTROL

AFM 70-10 ATTACH #3
"CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED"

SSDR 70-10 ATTACH #1
"EXAMPLES OF FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING PROPOSALS"

10 ITEMS & 10 SUBPANELS

1.1 ASSEM & SERV. OF LG. STRUCT.
1.2 ORBITING VEHICLE
1.3 LABORATORY VEHICLE
1.4 CREW PROV. & HUM. FACT.
1.5 EXPERIMENTS ACCOM.
2.1 ORG RESOURCES
2.2 PROGRAM PLANNING
2.3 PROGRAM CONTROL
3.1 COST CONT & ANAL.
3.2 COST METHODOLOGY

30 FACTORS

1.1.1 1.5.3
1.1.2 1.5.4
1.1.3 2.1.1
1.2.1 2.1.2
1.2.2 2.1.3
1.2.3 2.2.1
1.3.1 2.2.2
1.3.2 2.3.1
1.3.3 2.3.2
1.3.4 3.1.1
1.4.1 3.1.2
1.4.2 3.1.3
1.4.3 3.1.4
1.5.1 3.2.1
1.5.2 3.2.2

ORGANIZATION OF CONTRACTOR FINAL REPORTS PER PCO LTR DATED 8 APRIL 1965

SSSB LTR OF INSTRUCTIONS TO EVALUATION GROUP CHAIRMAN ATTACH #1
"CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED"
EVALUATION TECHNIQUE

88 SUBFACTORS

SELECTED, DESCRIBED, WEIGHTED BY PANEL & SUB PANEL CHAIR MEN IN JOINT SESSION 21-23 APRIL

TOTAL CONTRACTOR AREA SCORES SUBMITTED TO SSSB FOR AREA WEIGHTING

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

10 EXCELLENT
8 VERY GOOD
6 GOOD (NORMAL)
4 FAIR
2 POOR
0 UNACCEPTABLE
N INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION

SCORES ABOVE OR BELOW "6" REQUIRE WRITTEN COMMENTS

WEIGHTS APPLIED TO EACH RAW SCORE

6 4 24

ALL SUBFACTOR SCORES UNDER ONE FACTOR ARE TOTALED

EACH OF 30 FACTOR SCORES BACKED BY NARRATIVE JUSTIFICATION

SCORES ABOVE OR BELOW "6" REQUIRE WRITTEN COMMENTS

WEIGHTS APPLIED TO EACH RAW SCORE

6 4 24
PRELIMINARY DESIGN STUDY SUMMARIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Major Subs and Associates</th>
<th>% Subcontracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>Honeywell-Philco-Hughes</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>IBM-Collins Radio-Sperry Gyro</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Elec.</td>
<td>Martin-Republic</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed</td>
<td>McDonnell - Garrett/Airesearch</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORBIT TEST CHAMBER</th>
<th>LV ASSEMBLY BLDG</th>
<th>OV TEST ASSEMBLY BLDG</th>
<th>ACOUSTIC TEST CHAMBER</th>
<th>GENERAL ENGINEERING</th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A (SIZE ?)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C (SIZE ?)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NO (WPAFB)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M** MODIFICATION REQUIRED  
**A** AVAILABLE  
**C** CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED
EVALUATION GROUP FINDINGS
EARTH OBSERVATION MISSION

WITH MULTI-SENSORS
MOL/100 FT. ANTENNA
WITH MULTI-SENSORS
MOL CONFIGURATION
CONTRACTOR A

1.0 TECHNICAL
ASSEMBLY & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES
ORBITING VEHICLE
LABORATORY VEHICLE
CREW PROVISIONS & HUMAN FACTORS
EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION

2.0 MANAGEMENT
ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES
PROGRAM PLANNING
PROGRAM CONTROL

3.0 COST METHODOLOGY & CONTROL
COST CONTROL & ANALYSIS
COST METHODOLOGY
CONTRACTOR A

STRONG

- AGE DEV AND INTEGRATION
- SIMULATION
- INTERFACE ANALYSIS
- SPECIFICATION REVISIONS
- EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION
- TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT
- PROGRAM MANAGEMENT, CONFIGURATION & DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURES
- PROGRAM PLANS
- COST PROPOSAL

WEAK

- LARGE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS
- CREW HYGIENE, PERFORMANCE AND UTILIZATION
CONTRACTOR B

1.0 TECHNICAL

ASSEMBLY & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES ORBITING VEHICLE
LABORATORY VEHICLE CREW PROVISIONS & HUMAN FACTORS
EXPERIMENTS ACcommodation

2.0 MANAGEMENT

ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES PROGRAM PLANNING
PROGRAM CONTROL

3.0 COST METHODOLOGY & CONTROL

COST CONTROL & ANALYSIS COST METHODOLOGY
CONTRACTOR B

**STRONG**
- Mission Operations Integration
- Orbital Analysis
- Large Structure Analysis
- Integration PERT/Cost & Accounting System

**WEAK**
- Maneuvering and Stabilization Subsystem Design
- Ground Checkout Equipment Analysis
- Simulation
MOL OPTICAL CONFIGURATIONS
SECRET

LABORATORY VEHICLE

EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION
SECRET
LABORATORY VEHICLE
BASIC MODULES
CONTRACTOR C

1.0 TECHNICAL

ASSEMBLY & SERVICE OF LARGE STRUCTURES
ORBITING VEHICLE
LABORATORY VEHICLE
CREW PROVISIONS & HUMAN FACTORS
EXPERIMENTS ACCOMMODATION

2.0 MANAGEMENT

ORGANIZATION & RESOURCES
PROGRAM PLANNING
PROGRAM CONTROL

3.0 COST METHODOLOGY & CONTROL

COST CONTROL & ANALYSIS
COST METHODOLOGY
CONTRACTOR C

**STRONG**

- Reconnaissance Analysis & Operational Growth
- Structural Analysis & Design
- Crew Conditioning & Evaluation

**WEAK**

- Large Structure Analysis
- PreLaunch & Launch Integration
- Age Design
- Program Management, Configuration & Documentation Procedures
- Program Plans
- Cost Estimate Data
- Crew Utilization
RECONNAISSANCE

FLAT REFLECTING MIRROR

AIRLOCK

HEAT SHIELD

EARTH

P1, P2, P3

P11, P12

ETS

SPECIAL ACCESS REQUIRED
PROGRAM 632A
CONTRACTOR D

STRONG

- LARGE STRUCTURE ANALYSIS
- PHYSIOLOGICAL STANDARDS
- CREW HEALTH & HUMAN PERFORMANCE
- GROUND CHECKOUT EQUIPMENT
- DEVELOPMENT TEST & SIMULATION PLAN
- TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

WEAK

- COST ANALYSIS
- COST METHODOLOGY
- LAB SUBSYSTEMS
# Summary of Evaluation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>UNWEIGHTED SCOR</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Technical</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Management</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Cost Methodology &amp; Control</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

OF

SSSB FINDINGS
WEIGHTING RATIONALE

- CONTRACTOR TASKS PREDOMINANTLY TECHNICAL
- CONTRACTOR MUST POSSESS FOLLOW-ON SYSTEM ACQUISITION CAPABILITY
- COSTS TREATED SEPARATELY
- TECHNICAL VS. MGMT/COST CONSIDERATION
## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTORS (BY RELATIVE RANK)</th>
<th>TECHNICAL</th>
<th>MGMT</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW SCORE</td>
<td>RAW SCORE</td>
<td>RAW SCORE</td>
<td>RAW SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>694.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>634.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>603.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMEND CONTRACTOR A

BE SELECTED FOR M.O.L

PROGRAM DEFINITION PHASE