Option Summary Comparison

	Option 1 - NASA Reinvention	Option 2 - Non-Profit Institute	Option 3 - FFRDC	Option 4 - Gov Corporation
a. Business Model Definition	A new Enterprise that manages utilization infrastructure to facilitate ISS utilization.	A contract to a non-profit organization devoted to research.	A not-for-profit entity, operating as a strategic partner with NASA to solve complex technical problems associated with research and analysis	A non-profit entity which combines the flexibility of a business with the public purpose and duties of the government
b. Functional Description	The new Enterprise provides focus on STS/ ISS Utilization Management and provides greater advocacy and visibility to the user community.	The Institute provides Science/Technology/ Commercial leadership, manages Guest Investigator programs, and sustains and/or develops designated payloads.	An entity that performs strategic and tactical utilization management, Science/ Technology/Commercial leadership, customer integration and operations support, and manages data dissemination and	The Government Corporation provides a customer-centric organization to facilitate and optimize academic, government, and industry utilization of the ISS.
1. Functions transitioned to the NGO	n/a	Lead: 13a, 18, 19, 20 Lead: 3a, 4, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9 - case specific Lead: 1b, 3, 4, 5a - GI only Support: 1a, 2, 5b, 6b	Lead: 1b, 1c, 3a, 3c, 4, 5, 6* (customer support), 6c, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20 Support: 0, 1a, 2a	All except 0, 12, 17
2. Functions retained by NASA	All	0, 1a, 1c, 2, 4, 5b, 10, 11, 12, 13b, 14, 15, 16 3, 4, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9 case specific	0, 1 (contract oversight), 2, 6a, 6b, 12, 15	0, 12
c. Proposed Transition Period	FY03-FY04	FY05-FY09	FY04 - FY07	FY06-FY08
d. Unweighted Blue Team Evaluation Criteria Score	**25**	**21**	**25**	**29**
e. Major Strengths (3)	1. Integrated flight research strategy across NASA, other government agencies, and platforms	1. Provides independent leadership for, and representation of, S/T/C user community while NASA Enterprises retain control of ISS utilization priorities and	1. Leads all Functions necessary to represent S/T/C community	1. Powerful organization with high likelihood of realizing positive change for ISS Utilization
	2. Customer focus with Smart Integration Team responding to customer needs	2. Maintains the balance of technical and leadership competencies between NASA and the Institute	2. Ability to partner w/NASA to represent ISS users at all appropriate board levels	2. Direct access to Congress and capability for self-promotion and revenue production
	3. Utilize current human capital strengths and experience within NASA	3. Minimal impact to ISS vehicle, vehicle interfaces, and ongoing integrated engineering	3. Ability to more effectively advoate ISS users	3. Provides smooth and safe transition of functions and personnel
f. Major Weaknesses (3)	1. Perception as status quo	1. Difficult to provide leadership for all 3 (S/T/C) communities and multiple science disciplines with one	1. Interface concerns	1. Final content of Charter not controlled by NASA
	2. Perceived or real difficulty in reorganizing NASA	2. Responsibility for GI program selections and ability of staff to propose introduces potential for conflict of interest	2. By not incorporating PD function into the FFRDC model, a perceived inability to attract "best and brightest"	2. Requires long-term NASA Human Capital Strategy
	3. Lack of direct jurisdiction by research Codes over research flown on each and every increment	3. Delegating utilization manifesting to the Institute may negatively impact current efforts to consolidate and streamline STS and ISS	3. Potential for organizational abuse	3. Reduces NASA's ability to leverage expertise across Programs
g. Outcome Summaries				

1. Workforce (FTE)	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**
	CS/Cont	Total	CS/Cont	Total	CS/Cont	Total	CS/Cont	Total
FY03	631/1785	0	626/1780	0	626/1780	0	626/1780	0
FY05	589/1634	0	582/1621	73	375/1467	479	589/1634	65
FY07	557/1467	0	510/1271	412	243/371	1712	55/48	2331
2. Budget ($M)	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**	**NASA**	**NGO**
FY03	342	0	341	0	341	0	341	0
FY05	327	0	317	18	301	69	326	10
FY07	283	0	228	88	91	282	40	327
3. Potential Competency Impacts by Center	All: Low		All: Low		ARC: Medium GRC: Medium JSC: High KSC: Low MSFC: High		ARC: High GRC: High JSC: High KSC: High MSFC: High	
4. Potential Facility Impacts	Low		Low		Medium		Medium	
h. Ease of Establishment	Low		Medium		Medium		High	
i. Transition Difficulty	Low		Low		Medium		High	
j. Human Capital Impact	Low		Low-Medium		Medium-High		High	