

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Dryden Flight Research Center
P. O. Box 273
Edwards, CA 93523-0273



A/D-1422/BGB

May 11, 2010

Memorandum for the Record

FROM: A/Source Selection Official

SUBJECT: Source Selection Statement under Request for Proposal (RFP)
NND09308363R, titled, "Project Management Planning Support at the
NASA-Dryden Flight Research Center (NASA-DFRC)"

This memorandum documents the basis for my decision as the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the subject solicitation to select GRD, Incorporated of Doylestown, PA for contract award under the subject solicitation.

This procurement was solicited and evaluated under the provisions of NASA FAR Part 8.4, Federal Supply Schedules. The appointed evaluation team concluded evaluation of the two offers and presented their findings to me on May 4, 2010. Assessment included consideration of the following factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Price evaluation. The weighting assigned stated Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

Details of the evaluation results and findings were presented to me and other senior Center personnel. During the presentation, I asked questions and received clarifications to the team's findings, as needed, to more accurately reflect the evaluation results. I am confident that those results form a solid basis upon which I may make this selection decision. The following summarizes my decision:

Proposals in response to this solicitation were received from two Offerors (in alphabetical order), GRD, Inc. (Doylestown, PA), and Syneren Technologies Corporation (Lanham, MD). Using the findings presented by the team, and not taking any exceptions, I note that the proposal from GRD, Inc. had an overall characterization of Very Good. The GRD, Inc. overall characterization resulted from a combination of their number of Mission Suitability significant strengths with no significant weaknesses which resulted in a Mission Suitability characterization of Very Good, a Past Performance characterization of Very Good, and a lower proposed/evaluated Price.

The Syneren offer had an overall characterization of Good. The Syneren overall characterization resulted from a combination of their number of Mission Suitability significant

strengths and weaknesses which resulted in a Mission Suitability characterization of Good, a Past Performance characterization of Good, and a higher proposed/evaluated Price.

Mission Suitability Factor

The GRD, Inc. proposal received three (3) significant strengths and 13 strengths. GRD, Inc. had no significant weaknesses and six (6) weaknesses. The significant strengths include:

- Clear understanding of Eliyahu Goldratt's Theory of Constraints and how the application of this theory would have a profound positive impact on the performance of NASA-DFRC projects.
- Describes in detail the methodology to be used to develop integrated master schedules. This includes the use of a number of tool GRD developed specifically for this task, including a library of Microsoft Project macros.
- Retention of current in-place workforce to help ensure continuity with least possible disruption.

The Syneren proposal received two (2) significant strengths and 13 strengths. The Syneren proposal also received three (3) significant weaknesses and seven (7) weaknesses. The significant strengths include:

- Proposes to retain the current in-place workforce to help ensure continuity with least possible disruption.
- Comprehensive plan to recruit, orient, and train new employees. Plan includes a skills assessment and substantial training in all job related areas for all new employees.

The Syneren significant weaknesses include:

- Provides very little discussion of the issues involved with the application of project planning and scheduling to the aerospace environment. Nor did the offeror demonstrate understanding the issues associated with planning and scheduling a diverse set of projects ranging from very small to very large and encompassing missions such as Aeronautics Research, Airborne Science, and Exploration Systems.
- Failed to specifically address NASA-DFRC project management processes or to adequately discuss how Agency processes would be implemented at NASA-DFRC.
- Did not specifically address the methods and techniques to be used to develop or maintain the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS).

Past Performance Factor

In the Past Performance criterion, I find that GRD, Inc. proposal was characterized as Very Good. This characterization resulted from the existence of three referenced contracts that are all relevant, current and of similar size/magnitude to this procurement. The team found these referenced contracts to be a significant strength. Under the contracts, GRD's past performance

was mostly characterized by customers as being highly relevant, and with performance as being very good to excellent. There were no significant weaknesses identified by the team in GRD's past performance.

In the Past Performance criterion, I find that Syneren's proposal was rated Good. This rating resulted from the existence of three referenced contracts. Under those contracts, Syneren's past performance was characterized by customers as being split between highly relevant and no relevance, and with performance as being equally split between very good and excellent. There were no significant strengths or weaknesses identified by the team in Syneren's past performance.

Price

I noted that the prices proposed and evaluated for each offeror was as follows:

GRD, Inc.	\$7.368M
Syneren	\$8.690M

The prices noted above include phase-in, the firm fixed price for the base and option periods, and the cost no-fee amounts for the base and option periods. There were not any calculation adjustments, non-conformance issues, nor balance issues for either offeror.

Based upon the findings presented, and applying the weighting described in the solicitation, I determine that the proposal received from GRD, Inc. to be the best overall value to the Government. This determination reflects GRD's higher number of significant Mission Suitability strengths, fewer Mission Suitability weaknesses, Very Good past performance and lower proposed and evaluated price. It is the combination of these findings, and not any single factor, that forms the basis for my decision.

I further conclude that holding discussions would not likely result in another offeror being able to overcome my decision that the GRD, Inc. provides the best value to the Government for this requirement. Therefore, I select GRD, Inc. for the award of a contract resulting from this solicitation without final revisions being requested.



 Brian G. Bowman
 Source Selection Official

5/11/10

 Date