

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001**

**Selection of Contractor
For
Rotary Wing Engineering, Modeling, and Simulation (REMS)
NNA364420R-ALR**

30 November 2012

On 19 October 2012, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) ex-officio members, met with the SEC members appointed to evaluate proposals received in response to the Rotary Wing Engineering Modeling, and Simulation (REMS) procurement. During this meeting, the SEC provided its Initial Findings Presentation to me. The findings were discussed to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

The SEC evaluated one proposal. I assessed the SEC's findings and evaluation of that proposal. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment, which is based upon assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and the evaluation criteria prescribed in the Request for Proposal (RFP). My selection decision is set forth below.

Procurement Description

ARC has a continuing need for research of new utilizations and efficiencies in the National Airspace System (NextGen) to enable extensive vertical lift transportation capability, develop critical technologies for more efficient, faster, more productive and safe rotary wing vehicles, and to allow other U.S. agencies to meet unique critical technology needs in rotorcraft development and utilization.

The services provided will support NASA, the Army, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This procurement will yield a contract that will provide continued support of research and development to the rotorcraft community.

This procurement was conducted as a Small Business Set-Aside and will result in a single award, Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Cost plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) task orders. The minimum amount of supplies or services that will be ordered during the effective period of this contract is \$25,000.00, and the maximum amount is \$20,000,000.00. The period of performance is five years with no options.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation, paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, advised Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received and without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror was required to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a technical and cost standpoint. However, the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on initial offers was determined not to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP identified three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Cost (Volume III). Of these evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is moderately more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is moderately more important than Cost. Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Cost.

The Mission Suitability Factor consisted of three Sub-factors. The Sub-factors are shown below with their respective point allocation, which signifies their weight.

| MISSION SUITABILITY | |
|--|------------------------|
| Sub-factors | Assigned Weight |
| 1. Technical Capabilities, Staffing and Facilities | 400 |
| 2. Understanding the Requirement | 350 |
| 3. Management Plan | 250 |
| TOTAL | 1000 |

The Mission Suitability proposal was evaluated based on the offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements. The evaluation subfactors were used to evaluate the offeror's approaches to implementing the functions and specifications delineated in the Statement of Work. Through the Mission Suitability Factor, the SEC sought to determine that the offeror indicated a thorough understanding of the work that is expected to be accomplished. The SEC was primarily interested in the entities (an entity is defined as an organization such as a division or branch or a corporation, or a parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the corporation) actually performing the work with regard to their formal training, technical expertise and capability to perform.

In accordance with NFS 1815.370(h)(2), the Mission Suitability Sub-factors were assigned adjectival ratings and numerical scores. The overall Mission Suitability Factor received a numerical score only. The Mission Suitability adjectival ratings for the Sub-factors were: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. In Section M, paragraph M.2(b)(1), Mission Suitability Factor, the RFP defined these adjectival ratings as well as provided applicable percentile ranges at each rating level.

The Past Performance evaluation assessed the Offeror's performance under previously awarded contracts. It was an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The evaluation was performed in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2). The confidence rating was based on the information provided by the Offeror in its Past Performance Volume II and customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of the Offeror. The RFP required evaluation of the Past Performance Factor using the following level of confidence ratings: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral. In Section M, paragraph M.2(b)(2), the RFP defined these level of confidence ratings. The SEC evaluated the Offeror's suitability to fulfill the requirements of this contract, as prescribed in Section M of the RFP.

The SEC evaluated the currency and relevancy of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the Offeror. The SEC also evaluated overall past performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition.

For the Cost Factor, the SEC assessed what the Offeror's proposal would cost the Government should it be selected for award. The overall evaluated cost for selection purposes was determined by the sum of the costs proposed for the three sample task orders.

In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(i), the SEC performed a cost analysis to assess the cost realism of the 3 sample task orders.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

ARC issued a Draft Request for Proposals (DRFP) that allowed for industry questions and comments on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach in satisfying the requirements.

All documents pertinent to the acquisition were posted electronically on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities portal (http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nais/link_syp.cgi) as well as the Federal Business Opportunities web portal (<https://www.fbo.gov>). The draft RFP was released on February 2, 2012. The final RFP was released on April 9, 2012. One (1) Amendment was posted to NAIS and FBO. Amendment 1 was posted on May 23, 2012, and it contained questions and answers regarding the RFP. Proposals in response to the final RFP were due on May 30, 2012.

Two proposals were received in response to the RFP by the specified closing date and time. The Offerors' names and addresses (listed alphabetically) are as follows:

MONTEREY TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED (MTI)
24600 Silver Cloud Court, Suite 103
Monterey, CA 93940

STRATEGIC VISUALIZATION SERVICES CORPORATION
17045 El Camino Real, Suite 211
Houston, TX 77058

The proposal submitted by Strategic Visualization Services was determined non-responsive; therefore, only the Monterey Technology Inc. proposal was evaluated.

Evaluation Process

After receipt, the SEC members individually reviewed the proposal and met to discuss individual findings. Following review of the Mission Suitability proposal, the SEC identified strengths and weaknesses. In the Mission Suitability Factor, the identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized as a "Significant Strength" or "Significant Weakness" or, if not significant, as a "Strength" or a "Weakness." Following NFS 1815.305, strength and weakness findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Sub-factor. Then, a numerical score was assigned for the overall Mission Suitability Factor. The SEC did not identify any "Deficiency" findings in the Mission Suitability proposal.

The SEC members evaluated Past Performance and identified findings based on the Offeror's proposal and the questionnaires completed by past and current customers. In the Past Performance evaluation, the identified findings were not categorized as strengths or weaknesses. NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A) gives discretion to the individual NASA Centers on whether to assign strengths or weaknesses. For purposes of this procurement, NASA ARC decided not to assign strengths or weaknesses in the Past Performance Factor. The SEC's evaluation documented the Offeror's relevant past performance and the currency of the past performance to assess the Offeror's overall confidence rating. The SEC assigned an overall confidence rating to the Offeror based on the information provided.

The SEC and the Price Analyst reviewed the Cost proposal in accordance with FAR 15.4, and evaluated the proposal for both cost realism and price reasonableness. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Cost Factor.

The SEC briefed me on its initial findings on October 19, 2012, after which I directed the SEC to award on initial offer.

All SEC members evaluated MTI's proposal and findings were identified for each Factor and Sub-factor, if applicable. In accordance with NFS 1815.370(h)(2), an adjectival rating (e.g. Excellent, Very Good, etc.) and a numerical score were assigned to each Mission Suitability Sub-Factor. A numerical score, but not an adjectival rating, was assigned for the overall Mission Suitability Factor. For the Cost Factor, the SEC and Price Analyst evaluated the cost realism and price reasonableness of the proposal. In accordance with the solicitation, the SEC also determined whether the proposals adequately demonstrated the Offerors' ability to perform the work with the proposed resources. For the Past Performance Factor, a level of confidence

rating was assigned. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Cost Factor.

I reviewed the SEC's findings, adjectival ratings and numerical scores for Mission Suitability. I reviewed the findings and level of confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the Cost evaluation results, including the proposed costs and the cost realism and price reasonableness. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

Evaluation Findings of the SEC

Mission Suitability Factor

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for Monterey Technology Inc. (MTI).

MTI

The MTI Mission Suitability proposal received 795 points (out of a possible 1000 points).

In the Technical Capability, Staffing and Facilities Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 340 points (out of a possible 400 points). Two (2) Significant Strengths were identified as well as one (1) Strength. The Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) the technical expertise and capabilities of the Offeror's personnel; and (2) the complimentary technical expertise of the exceptionally strong group of subcontractors. The Strength was assigned for: (1) the Offeror's identification of specific, identifiable analysis and modeling tools available and expertise in their use that expand rotary wing research capability beyond the RFP's requirement.

In Understanding the Requirement Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 280 points (out of a possible 350 points). One (1) Significant Strength and one (1) Strength were identified. The Significant Strength was identified for the Offeror's clear and descriptive discussion on risk analysis and proactive steps to reduce technical risk, enhance workflow, increase productivity, improve quality and realize cost targets. The Strength was identified because the Offeror provided concise and sufficient technical detail in the proposal and for the three sample tasks in particular, to demonstrate full understanding of the scope of rotary wing research work required.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 175 points (out of a possible 250 points). One (1) Significant Strength was identified as well as one (1) Weakness. The Significant Strength was assigned for clearly describing a management plan structure well-tailored to Government requirements. Clear lines of authority have been established that start from the Program Manager/Chief Scientist and flow directly to the assigned workforce. The Weakness was assigned because plans for tracking and controlling

work and for supervising and monitoring performance will heavily rely on only one individual, the Offeror's Program Manager.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance findings for MTI. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A), strengths or weaknesses were not assigned. Past Performance was evaluated using a level of confidence rating.

The evaluation of MTI's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence.

The Offeror demonstrated very effective past technical performance, contract management, and corporate responsiveness on relevant contracts of comparable scope. There were no serious performance problems, terminations for default, or environmental or safety violations noted in the contracts used for past performance reference.

Cost Factor

The SEC evaluated the Offeror's Cost proposal. This included verifying the following: (1) compliance with the RFP requirements, (2) evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed rates, fringe benefits, overhead, G&A rates, and fee; and (3) ascertaining that proposed labor rates are reasonable for the labor market in which the contract will be performed. The cost elements were analyzed to include proposed labor rates and skill mix, indirect rates, and applicable fees. The Offeror's Cost proposal was deemed reasonable and realistic by the SEC and Price Analyst.

| Of fer or | Mission Suitability Adjectival Rating Technical Capability (400 Points) | Mission Suitability Adjectival Rating Understanding the Requirement (350 Points) | Mission Suitability Adjectival Rating Management Plan (250 Points) | Mission Suitability (1000 Points) | Past Performance Level of Confidence | Price (M) |
|-----------|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| MTI | Very Good (85%) 340 Pts | Very Good (80%) 280 Pts | Good (70%) 175 Pts | 1000 795 Pts | High | \$1.39M |

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR: Rotary Wing Engineering Modeling and Simulation (REMS)

FAR 15.308, "Source Selection Decision," states: "The source selection authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented, and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEC's findings. I did not simply count the numbers of Significant Strengths and Strengths; rather, I considered the potential impact of Significant Strengths and Strengths and their relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

Assessment of the SEC's findings

I carefully studied all of the findings of the SEC, and I concur with all of them. I am fully satisfied that the SEC conducted a thorough and cogent analysis of the proposal submitted and that their findings are appropriate and reasonable. As the SSA, I hereby adopt all of the findings of the SEC.

Selection

Because only one responsive proposal was received, only Monterey Technology Inc.'s proposal was evaluated and considered for award.

As the Source Selection Official, I determine that MTI is fit to provide the requirements as requested in the Request for Proposals posted on April 09, 2012. MTI received a Very Good rating in Mission Suitability which demonstrates its technical merit in meeting quality, schedule and safety requirements. MTI received a High Level of Confidence in Past Performance which further indicates its ability to do the work. MTI's proposed costs are deemed fair and reasonable. The findings provided to me by the SEC team give me confidence that MTI will be able to successfully perform the REMS requirements at a fair and reasonable price to the Government.

I select MTI for contract award.



Dr. Thomas A. Edwards
Source Selection Authority