



John H. Glenn Research Center
Lewis Field
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191

Source Selection Statement

Glenn Engineering and Scientific Support
(GESS-3)

NNC11ZD0009R

Procurement History/Description

This procurement provides engineering, research and technology development, operations, and project management support to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Glenn Research Center (GRC). The type of support to be provided includes:

- Engineering Support - Mechanical and Fluids Systems, Avionics and Electrical, Systems Engineering and Analysis, Manufacturing Engineering
- Research and Technology Development Support - Space Processes and Experiments, Communications, Instrumentation and Controls, Power and In-Space Propulsion, Aeropropulsion, and Structures and Materials
- Operations Support - Facilities Engineering Support and Testing Engineering Support
- Project Management Support - Configuration/Data Management, Schedule, and Project Technical Analysis

Services will primarily be performed at the GRC's Lewis Field located in Cleveland, Ohio, its Plum Brook Station located in Sandusky, Ohio, and at the contractor's local facility. This procurement is the follow-on to contract NNC06BA07B for similar type services.

To accomplish this requirement, the Government anticipates a contract consisting of a base work effort plus an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) effort. The base work effort will be Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) while the IDIQ effort will be Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF). The total period of performance will not exceed 5 years with the actual periods coinciding with the Government fiscal years.

A sources sought notice was issued on March 10, 2011. A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on April 5, 2011. On April 13, 2011, an Industry Day was held with 33 potential offerors in attendance. The Final RFP was issued on May 18, 2011, as a Small Business Administration 8(a) set-aside.

Four (4) proposals were received on July 8, 2011. After an initial review, all were considered initially acceptable and included in the formal evaluation process. The proposals were submitted by:

- Anadarko, LLC
- Micro Technologies, LLC

- ASRC Research & Technology Solutions (ARTS)
- Vantage Partners, LLC

Evaluation Procedures

All proposals were evaluated by a designated Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 – Source Selection, NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3 – Source Selection, and the evaluation criteria included in the RFP.

The RFP evaluation criteria consisted of the following factors: Mission Suitability, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Cost/Price.

The Mission Suitability Factor was evaluated and a numerical rating established. The subfactor weighting is indicated below:

Mission Suitability (1,000 points TOTAL)

A. Overall Understanding of the Requirements (UR) (300 points)

- UR1 - Technical Approach to Meeting the Requirements of the SOW
- UR2 - Risk Management Plan

B. Management Plan (MP) (400 points)

- MP1 - Organizational Structure and Management Plan
- MP2 - Subcontractor Management
- MP3 - Recruitment, Retention, Staffing and Compensation
- MP4 - Phase-In Plan
- MP5 - Offsite Facility, Proximity, and Connectivity
- MP6 - Key Personnel

C. Work Management (300 points)

- WO1 - Work Control System
- WO2 - Technical Quality Control

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was not numerically scored but was evaluated using the Level of Confidence ratings included in the RFP.

The Cost/Price Factor was not numerically scored. The proposed costs were evaluated and a probable cost analysis and adjustment was performed.

Of the evaluation factors identified above, Mission Suitability is approximately equal to Relevant Experience and Past Performance, which is approximately equal to Cost. Mission Suitability plus Relevant Experience and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

To facilitate the evaluation process under Mission Suitability, the SEB appointed various technical subcommittees. In accordance with the evaluation criteria of the RFP, the subcommittee members individually evaluated the proposals and caucused as a group, to establish consensus findings. The findings were reported to the SEB voting members.

The SEB voting members individually reviewed the proposals, considered the subcommittee findings, and then established SEB consensus findings. The SEB then assigned an adjectival rating and numerical score for each subfactor.

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was evaluated by the Relevant Experience and Past Performance subcommittee. In accordance with the evaluation criteria in the RFP, the subcommittee members individually evaluated the proposals and caucused as a group, to establish consensus findings. The findings were reported to the SEB voting members.

The SEB voting members individually reviewed the proposals, considered the subcommittee findings, and then established SEB consensus findings. The SEB then assigned a level of confidence rating to this Factor.

The Cost/Price Factor was evaluated by the Price Analyst. The proposal costs were reviewed for compliance with the RFP instructions, consistency with the technical approach, mathematical errors, and overall cost reasonableness. Field pricing support was requested from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA). An analysis was performed to establish the probable cost for each proposal.

The Government had developed an Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) prior to the release of the RFP.

The initial findings are indicated below:

Sub Factor	ARTS	Vantage	Anadarko	MicroTech
Mission Suitability Points	680	650	400	150
Relevant Experience and Performance	High	High	High	Moderate
Initial Proposed	\$262M	\$225M	\$225M	\$211M
Initial Probable	\$253M	\$232M	\$245M	\$261M
Competitive Range				

Competitive Range Determination

Based on the results of the initial evaluation, a Competitive Range Determination was made on August 24, 2011. It was determined that ARTS and Vantage provided the highest rated proposals and the best overall solution to the requirements of the RFP. While Anadarko and MicroTech addressed the elements of the RPF, the proposals were not highly rated and

provided no apparent advantages over the highest rated proposals. These proposals were not included in the Competitive Range and the offerors were notified on August 26, 2011.

Discussions

The remaining two firms, ARTS and Vantage, were notified of their inclusion in the Competitive Range with the intent of the Government to open discussions. Both companies were supplied a list of their identified weaknesses and a number of cost questions and concerns. Discussions opened on August 30, 2011. Over the following weeks, a series of telecons and one face-to-face meeting was held with each offeror. Discussions concluded on September 7, 2011, and an interim final proposal was requested of each offeror.

An interim final proposal was received from both offeror's on September 14, 2011. The proposals were reviewed, and no meaningful issues were identified to warrant additional discussions. On September 26, 2011, both offerors were requested to confirm the September 14, 2011, technical proposal as the final technical proposal and were provided updated pricing instructions. Submissions were received on September 29, 2011.

Final Findings

Final technical and cost evaluation was completed on the submitted information. Final findings are indicated below.

ASRC Research & Technology Solutions (ARTS)

Mission Suitability Factor - 688 Points.

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, the proposal was rated "very good." The proposal contained one significant strength: an exceptional understanding of the technical requirements of the SOW in Engineering, Research & Technology, Operations and Project Management. The proposal contained two strengths: a detailed and thorough description of several processes and tools for improving products, outcomes and deliverables under the Statement of Work (SOW); and a detailed and thorough discussion of risks associated with the SOW and recommended appropriate mitigation plans. No weaknesses were identified

In the Management Plan Subfactor, the proposal was rated "good." The proposal contained no significant strengths and six strengths: a detailed and thorough discussion of its organizational structure; a detailed and thorough discussion of its Plan to manage the contract; a detailed and thorough discussion of its Subcontractor Management Plan; a detailed and thorough discussion on contract recruitment, retention, and compensation; a detailed and thorough discussion of its contract Phase-in Plan; and highly appropriate key positions and a highly qualified team of personnel. No weaknesses were identified.

In the Work Management Subfactor, the proposal was rated "good." The proposal contained no significant strengths and one strength: a detailed and thorough discussion of the approach to deliver quality products. The proposal contained no significant weaknesses and one weakness: the proposal did not meet all the requirements of the WO1 of the RFP and Appendix C.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "High Level of Confidence."

The proposal contained two significant strengths: the ARTS Team had prior contracts similar in size and scope, which are considered highly relevant to the GESS-3 contract; and the ARTS Team was rated excellent (84.05%) to very good (13.50%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires. The proposal had one strength: the ARTS team was rated very good to excellent by the majority of clients in the Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). One contract was identified that contained satisfactory ratings. No weaknesses were identified.

Cost/Price Factor.

The proposal cost was \$240,040,977. A probable cost analysis was performed and an upward adjustment of \$30,214 was made which reflected the Government estimate for travel and training costs. The Government's final probable cost was \$240,071,190.

One issue was identified: ARTS did not properly forecast out-year indirect rates. The overall cost proposal confidence level is "medium."

**Vantage Partners, LLC
(Vantage Systems, Inc & SGT, Inc.)**

Mission Suitability Factor - 679 Points.

In the Understanding the Requirements Subfactor, the proposal was rated "good." The proposal contained no significant strengths. The proposal contained two strengths: a detailed and thorough understanding of technical requirements of the SOW for systems engineering, project management, and Research & Technology development; and a detailed and thorough discussion of the risks associated with the SOW using the Risk Management process as required and outlined in the NASA Standard (NPR 8000.4a). No weaknesses were identified.

In the Management Plan Subfactor, the proposal was rated "good." The proposal contained no significant strengths and seven strengths: a detailed and thorough discussion of its Management Plan; a detailed and thorough discussion of the organizational structure; a detailed discussion of its approach to overall Subcontract Management; a detailed and thorough discussion of contract recruitment, retention, compensation, and staff augmentation; a detailed and thorough discussion of its contract Phase-in Plan; a detailed and thorough discussion of the physical security plan and an integrated schedule of the preparations for the proposed facility; and identified highly appropriate key positions and a highly qualified team of key personnel. No weaknesses were identified.

In the Work Management Subfactor, the proposal was rated "good." The proposal contained no significant strengths and one strength: a detailed and thorough discussion of the approach to deliver quality products. No weaknesses were identified.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: "High Level of Confidence."

The proposal contained two significant strengths: the Vantage Team was rated Excellent (91.67%) to Very Good (6.80%) in client responses to the Past Performance Questionnaires; and the Vantage Team was consistently rated excellent by the majority of clients in the Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The proposal had one strength: the Vantage Team had prior contracts similar in size and scope which are considered highly relevant to the GESS-3 contract. No weaknesses were identified.

Cost/Price Factor

The proposal cost was \$230,366,505. A probable cost analysis was performed and a downward adjustment of \$204,033 was made which represented a cost item duplication in the other direct costs category of the proposal. The final probable cost was \$230,162,472.

No issues were identified. The overall cost proposal confidence level is "high."

A Source Selection meeting was held on October 27, 2011. Attendance included the Source Selection Authority, SEB members, and key senior GRC Management officials. During the meeting, the overall evaluation process and findings of the two remaining offerors were presented and discussed in detail. The meeting concluded with no selection decision.

A brief "executive session" was held on October 28, 2011, to finalize the selection decision. In attendance were the Source Selection Authority, key senior GRC Management officials, and key SEB members. The SEB members responded to questions and the key findings were reviewed and discussed among the attendees.

Selection Decision

Based on the information presented and the two meeting sessions, I fully understand the evaluation process, the SEB findings, and concur with the overall SEB results. I understand that the three Factors were approximately equal in weighting and considered that in my decision.

In the area of Mission Suitability, I note that the proposals were very competitive and only nine points separate the two proposals. I note that ARTS was rated "very good" in the Understanding the Requirements subfactor and received a significant strength in their overall understanding of the technical requirements of the SOW. ARTS was rated "good" in the remaining subfactors with a number of strengths concentrated in the Management Plan subfactor. The findings indicated ARTS is fully capable of performing the work effort with an experienced management team, a sound management approach and organizational structure, and an intended incumbent employee capture rate of 98 percent. I further note that ARTS did have a weakness in the Work Management subfactor in that the work control system did not address all the requirements of the subfactor. I understand this weakness was an initial proposal weakness, identified to ARTS during the discussion period, and remained a weakness after submission of the final proposal.

Relative to Vantage, I understand that Vantage was rated "good" in all the subfactors. Vantage received a "strength" in understanding the requirements of the SOW, and also had a number of strengths concentrated in the Management Plan subfactor. The findings indicated Vantage is fully capable of performing the work effort with an experienced management team, a sound management approach and organizational structure, and an intended incumbent employee capture rate of 95 percent. Vantage did not have any weaknesses.

In a direct comparison of the two proposals under Mission Suitability, I consider both offerors to have submitted proposals fully responsive to the RFP. I find both offerors fully capable to perform the work effort with effective management plans, organizational structures, and management teams. I acknowledge the "significant strength" of ARTS compared to the "strength" of Vantage in Understanding the Requirements and further understand that the Vantage proposal was not as detailed as ARTS in addressing all areas of the SOW. I further note that both proposals indicated a high capture rate of incumbent personnel, which would assure the continuity of the day to day work effort which I consider important. I do note that Vantage had an additional strength in addressing the overall requirements of MP5 relating to the offsite location and that ARTS had a weakness in the work control system. In considering the findings across the scope of this Factor, I find that the significant strength of ARTS is somewhat offset by the identified weakness, and the additional strength of Vantage relative to the offsite location. I therefore consider the proposals to be relatively equal in this Factor.

In the area of Relevant Experience and Performance, I note that the ARTS Team received a "high" level of confidence. The ARTS Team received a "significant strength" in contract relevancy, and a "significant strength" and "strength" for overall contract performance. I understand the ARTS Team has direct relevant contract experience with the current GESS contract as well as other large contracts considered highly relevant to the anticipated effort. In reviewing the overall performance information available, I understand the performance ratings ranged from very good to excellent across the majority of the contracts with satisfactory ratings identified for one contract.

Relative to the Vantage Team, I note that the team received a "high" level of confidence. I understand that the newly formed JV had no existing contract experience as the JV but the experience of the joint venture partners can be considered per applicable FAR regulations and GAO decisions. The Vantage Team received a "strength" for contract relevancy and two "significant strengths" for overall contract performance. I understand that the Vantage Team had various contracts considered highly relevant to this effort although the Vantage Systems JV partner did not have contracts considered to be relevant to this effort. In reviewing the overall performance information available, I understand that the performance ratings were consistently in the excellent range for the majority of the contracts.

In a direct comparison, I find that the ARTS Team has direct relevant contract experience with the current GESS contract. The Vantage Team's relevant contract experience is not to the overall level of ARTS but is still noteworthy. The overall performance of both offerors has also been noteworthy with the ARTS Team ratings ranging from very good to excellent for the majority of the contracts reviewed and the Vantage Team consistently receiving excellent ratings for the majority of contracts reviewed. In considering the findings across the scope of the Factor, I find that the relevancy of the ARTS Team prior contacts to be somewhat offset by the overall consistent high-end ratings of the Vantage Team contracts. I therefore consider the proposals to be relatively equal in this Factor.

In the area of Cost/Price, I note the ARTS proposed cost of \$240,040,977, an upward adjustment by the SEB of \$30,000, and a final probable cost of \$240,071,190. I understand the cost adjustment was due to contractor estimates in travel and training that were below the provided Government estimates. I further understand that the DCAA audit report questioned the methodology used to forecast out-year indirect rates. This led to a "medium" confidence rating.

For Vantage, I note a proposed cost of \$230,366,505, a downward adjusted of \$204,033, and a final probable cost of \$230,162,472. I understand the downward adjustment related to the duplication of office supply related costs. A DCAA audit was completed with no issues identified. Vantage received a "high" confidence rating.

I consider the final Government proposal adjustments to be minor given the large value of the anticipated contract effort. I understand the issues behind the DCAA audit for ARTS and understand that these issues had no impact on the probable cost calculation and note the ARTS proposal cost price and probable cost to be nearly identical.

In a direct comparison of the probable cost between the two proposals, the cost difference was primarily due to the indirect rate structure of the proposals. The proposed work years and salary structure of the two proposals were very similar which would be expected given the extent of cost information provided in the RFP. I further understand that the Government's initial cost issues had been disclosed during discussion and each company responded to the cost issues.

I find nothing that suggests additional contractor information would significantly affect the Government's probable cost analysis. In the final comparison, there exists a \$9.9M difference in the probable cost between the two offerors with a high level of confidence in the Vantage cost proposal. I find the \$9.9M to be meaningful and represent's savings to the Government. I therefore find Vantage to possess a meaningful advantage in this Factor directly attributable to the lower proposed and probable costs.

In summary, I find both proposals to be fully responsive to the RFP and capable of successfully performing the contract work effort. I believe work continuity can be achieved under either offeror due to the number of incumbent employees planning to be hired. I find both offerors to be relatively equal under the Mission Suitability Factor and the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor.

However, I do find a meaningful advantage in the area of Cost/Price for the Vantage Team. This cost advantage amounts to approximately \$9.9M over the 5 year period. I find no meaningful Mission Suitability Factor or Past Performance Factor advantage for ARTS that would outweigh this cost advantage by Vantage. Vantage has fully responded to the requirements of the RFP and has displayed the potential to successfully perform the contract requirements at a lower overall cost to the Government.

I therefore select the Vantage Partners, LLC to perform the Glenn Engineering and Scientific Support as outlined in the request for proposal NNC11ZD0009R.



Ramon Lugo
Director, Glenn Research Center
Source Selection Authority