

**Source Selection Statement for the  
Advanced Space Suit for High Fidelity Testing (Z-2) Contract**

On April 10, 2013, I met with members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Advanced Space Suit for High Fidelity Testing (Z-2) acquisition, Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ13437303R. Several other officials of the Johnson Space Center also attended the meeting.

Z-2 is a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) contract. The Z-2 contract consists of an eighteen (18) month period of performance. The contract value is \$4,387,983. This amount includes the value of all work performed under the contract. This contract is not a follow-on contract.

The requirements defined in Section C of the RFP are to support the Advanced Extravehicular Activity (EVA) System Development Project at NASA Johnson Space Center (JSC) in Houston, Texas. The contractor provides a space suit assembly that is a complete and mature subsystem of the overall advanced exploration space suit for a human vacuum chamber test.

**Background**

On December 18, 2012, the contracting officer issued Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ13437303R with a proposal receipt date of February 8, 2013. Eight amendments were issued to the RFP.

RFP Section M.2, Award Without Discussions states that:

As provided for in FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions," the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except for clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussion if the Contract Officer later determines them to be necessary.

RFP Section M.5, Introduction states, in part, that:

The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for a demonstration of the Offeror's competence and capability to successfully complete the requirements specified in the Advanced Space Suit for High Fidelity Testing (Z-2) Statement of Work. Generally, the proposal shall:

- (a) Demonstrate understanding of the overall and specific requirements of the proposed contract;
- (b) Convey the company's capabilities for transforming understanding into accomplishment;
- (c) Provide, in detail, the plans and methods for so doing; and
- (d) Provide, as requested below, the price associated with so doing.

RFP Section M.7, Limited Tradeoff (LTO) Proposal Evaluation, states, in part, that:

An initial review of proposals will be conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation.

The remaining proposals will be evaluated against the Technical Acceptability requirements. All Technically Acceptable and Potentially Acceptable Offerors will be evaluated against past performance, predefined value characteristics, and cost criteria. The SLPT will carry out the evaluation activities and report to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), who is responsible for making the source selection decision. For those Offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable, tradeoffs will be made between predefined value characteristics, past performance, and cost. Past performance is more important than the combined value of the predefined value characteristics. The predefined value characteristics are considered of equal value to one another. Past performance and predefined value characteristics, when combined, are significantly more important than cost.

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation. The Government will award to the Offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government that meets all solicitation requirements and is determined responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104, Standards.

### **Evaluation Procedure**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP.

An initial evaluation was performed to determine if proposals were unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals, each Offeror was checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-Procurement Programs", and proposals were reviewed for compliance with the solicitation instructions.

Technical acceptability was assessed with ratings of 'acceptable,' 'potentially acceptable' or 'unacceptable.' Pursuant to the RFP, for technical acceptability, Offerors were required to be rated 'acceptable' or 'partially acceptable' in order to continue the evaluation process. Each 'acceptable' and 'potentially acceptable' proposal was given a past performance confidence assessment rating based on the SLPT's evaluation of available information regarding each Offeror's recent and relevant past performance based on the RFP as stated in part below.

**Recency:** Contracts with more recent performance were considered to be more recent than those with more remote performance, assuming all other considerations to be equal. If the contract was still ongoing, it must have a documented performance history. The Government did not consider performance on a newly awarded contract that had no documented performance history (in other words, projects that are less than six months under contract or less than 50% complete).

**Relevancy:** Relevancy was given an assessment of "Very Relevant," "Relevant," "Somewhat Relevant" or "Not Relevant" As defined in M.7 of the RFP.

The Past Performance evaluation assessed the degree of confidence the Government had in the Offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting technical, schedule and budget constraints. The Past Performance evaluation considered each Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements similar to this solicitation that met the user's needs. The SLPT relied upon 1) The narrative provided by the Offeror in Volume II, Past Performance; 2) Completed Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by the Offerors' customers on work similar to Advanced Space Suit for High Fidelity Testing (Z-2); 3) Conversations with COs and CORs to obtain details about the questionnaires; 4) OSHA logs, underwriter letters, and the OSHA website; and 5) Information independently obtained from other sources. Offerors were to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserved the right to use data and information provided by the Offeror and obtained from other sources. The Government considered the number and severity of any problems, the effectiveness of corrective actions taken and the overall record of Past Performance. It also considered the Offeror's record for technical performance, adherence to contract schedules, cost control and safety, health, and environmental performance. A performance confidence rating was assessed at the overall factor level for Past Performance after evaluating all aspects of an Offeror's recent and relevant past performance. The following past performance level of confidence ratings were utilized: "Very High Level," "High Level," "Moderate Level," "Low Level," "Very Low Level," and "Neutral."

Only items specifically proposed as Predefined Value Characteristics were evaluated as such. The following Predefined Value Characteristics were applicable to this procurement and were evaluated for reasonableness and feasibility and rated as "Significant Value Added", "Value Added", and "No Value Added":

Value Characteristic A (VCA) – The proposal describes a beneficial approach or method to advance the suit system towards flight readiness.

Value Characteristic B (VCB) – The proposal describes a beneficial and realistic approach to reducing suit weight below the required value.

Value Characteristic C (VCC) – The proposal describes a beneficial approach to suit sizing and fit that will improve suit sizing/fit beyond meeting the sizing requirement.

Value Characteristic D (VCD) – The proposal describes a beneficial approach to improving suit mobility beyond the requirements.

To ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the Government performed price and cost analysis, in accordance with FAR 15.305 - Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 - Proposal Analysis, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 - Proposal Evaluation.

The Government performed a cost realism analysis on each 'acceptable' or 'potentially acceptable' proposal at the cost element level inclusive of all costs for labor, non-labor resources, indirect rates and fee. Price and cost analysis included the total proposed cost and fee. The proposed cost for the sum of the entire period of performance was used for purposes of evaluation and selection.

## Evaluation of Proposals

Two Offerors submitted proposals in response to the RFP. The firms that submitted proposals are (in alphabetical order):

- (1) David Clark Company Inc. (DCCI)
- (2) ILC Dover (ILC)

Neither of the Offerors took exception to the RFP requirements. Both proposals were evaluated in accordance with the RFP as well as the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement Part 1815. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, the SLPT determined technical acceptability as follows: the proposal submitted by DCCI was rated 'acceptable', and the proposal submitted by ILC was rated 'acceptable.' The SLPT then evaluated Past Performance, Value Characteristics, and Cost/Price of these two proposals.

### Past Performance

#### David Clark Company, Inc.

The SLPT evaluated all reference contracts provided for DCCI and all reference contracts provided for its major subcontractor, Air-Lock, Inc. All reference contracts were found to be recent. Seven of DCCI's reference contracts were assessed as 'relevant', and one assessed as 'somewhat relevant' to their proposed role in Z-2.

The past performance reported included relevant work, including: the fabrication of Class I space suit hardware of similar quality and complexity to hardware required for the Z-2 effort; the design, development, testing, and evaluation of flight qualified hardware; and management and training experience for relevant hardware projects. The level of complexity for work performed in several of the reference contracts did not address the entire scope of the work to be performed by DCCI in their proposed role for Z-2. Several of the reference contracts included the magnitude and level of quality control required for the Z-2 effort, but did not address the specific technical challenges related to the development of a full high mobility EVA space suit assembly.

The SLPT also considered the Past Performance of DCCI's major subcontractor, Air-Lock, Inc. Air-Lock's reference contracts were assessed as 'relevant' to their role in performing work for the Z-2 development effort.

The SLPT reviewed all of this past performance information and assigned a Past Performance confidence rating of '**Moderate Level of Confidence**' to the DCCI Team.

#### ILC Dover

The SLPT evaluated all of the reference contracts provided for ILC and all reference contracts provided for its major subcontractor, Air-Lock, Inc. All reference contracts were found to be recent. Three of ILC's reference contracts were assessed as 'very relevant', three were 'relevant', and two 'somewhat relevant' to their proposed role in Z-2.

The magnitude (size and scope), complexity of the effort, and level of quality control for work performed was found to be comparable as that required of ILC's proposed role in Z-2. ILC has

recent experience developing full high-mobility EVA space suits. The Past Performance reported also includes maintaining and testing flight quality space suit systems in environments relative to the Z-2 effort.

The SLPT also considered the Past Performance of ILC's major subcontractor, Air-Lock. Air-Lock's reference contracts were assessed as 'relevant' to their role in performing work for the Z-2 development effort.

The SLPT reviewed all of this Past Performance information and assigned a Past Performance confidence rating of '**High Level of Confidence**' to the ILC Team.

### Value Characteristics

#### David Clark Company, Inc.

The SLPT reviewed the value characteristic information provided by DCCI for each of the Predefined Value Characteristic levels. For **VCA**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because DCCI described further developing the suit system towards flight readiness through the development of a Extravehicular Visor Assembly (EVVA) that would be compatible with flight coatings and the use of flight-like thermal micrometeorite garment TMG attachments. For **VCB**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because DCCI discusses several innovative ways to reduce SIP mass and potential weight savings through the use of carbon fiber and titanium. However, DCCI does not state they will be able to reduce the space suit weight below the requirement. For **VCC**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because DCCI proposes the use of analytical tools to optimize subject sizing and proposed a method to create finer sizing adjustments with variable bushing diameters. For **VCD**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because DCCI proposes to use a previously developed single axis joint (elbow and knee) that has 30% lower joint torque than the requirement. The joints that have the most impact on mobility are the hip and shoulders. While a 30% reduction in elbow and knee torque is beneficial, it will not significantly impact the overall suit mobility.

#### ILC Dover

The SLPT reviewed the value characteristic information provided by ILC for each of the Predefined Value Characteristic levels. For **VCA**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because the EVVA concept described the individual component cycle testing, and the addition of an experienced composite manufacturing partner all contribute towards advancing the flight readiness of the space suit assembly towards flight readiness beyond the minimum requirements. For **VCB**, a rating of '**significant value added**' was given because ILC proposed to reduce the suit assembly mass in a feasible manner to 145 lbs., 25 lbs. below the requirement. For **VCC**, a rating of '**value added**' was given because ILC outlined several means to better index the suit subject and fit subjects beyond the minimum requirement, including a suit sizing algorithm, a boot insert concept, a vernier sizing insert to bring the scye bearing into a better position for each individual subject, and finer torso sizing adjustment beyond the minimum requirement. For **VCD**, a rating of '**significant value added**' was given because ILC proposed to deliver an additional torso concept that would increase the fit and mobility of the suit beyond what would be expected of a normal hard upper torso suit, while further allowing for mission or task specific mobility optimization.

### Cost/Price

The SLPT received information from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) that both Offerors' accounting systems were determined to be adequate.

The cost proposals were evaluated consistent with the evaluation criteria in Section M of the RFP.

#### David Clark Company, Inc.

The Government's final probable cost and price for DCCI was **\$3.99M**. No adjustments were made to DCCI's proposed cost.

#### ILC Dover

The Government's final probable cost and price for ILC was **\$4.38M**. No adjustments were made to ILC proposed cost.

### Source Selection Decision

My decision is based on selecting the proposal offering the best value in accordance with the RFP's stated criteria for award. I reviewed the SLPT evaluation and posed a variety of questions, solicited the SLPT member views, expressed my own, and made the selection.

After considering the SLPT's answers to my questions in the context of the RFP's stated criteria, I took no exception to the SLPT's findings, and adopted its final evaluation. It was determined by the SLPT that there was no basis or advantage to conduct discussions after the initial evaluation, and I concurred with that determination.

I agreed with the SLPT that each Offeror provided a technical approach and a management approach that is at a level of completeness, feasibility and reasonableness, where associated risks do not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance. Therefore, I also agreed with the SLPT that both Offerors overall Technical Acceptability Rating was "Acceptable."

In assessing the relative value of the Past Performance findings for all proposals, I reviewed the SLPT documentation of the Past Performance and level of confidence ratings.

Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT and applying the RFP's stated Past Performance evaluation criteria, I determined an overall Past Performance confidence rating of 'Moderate Level of Confidence' for the DCCI team. I accepted the SLPT's findings that all reference contracts are recent and the Past Performance of the DCCI team was relevant to the solicitation's SOW requirements.

Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT and in accordance with the RFP's stated criteria, I determined an overall Past Performance confidence rating of 'High Level of Confidence' for the ILC team. I accepted the SLPT's findings that all reference

contracts were found to be recent and the Past Performance of the ILC Dover team was very relevant to the solicitation's SOW requirements.

Considering the entirety of the information provided by both Offerors, in addition to my independent knowledge and the SLPT's findings, I note my complete confidence that both Offerors could perform the work required by the solicitation's SOW. However, I noted that ILC has recent experience developing full high-mobility EVA space suits, design of which is complex and challenging; whereas, DCCI did not present any Past Performance for the development of a highly mobile complete EVA space suit system.

In assessing Value Characteristics for all proposals, I performed an evaluation of the Value Characteristics rating and their relative benefit to the Government. I noted that ILC proposed to reduce the suit assembly mass in a feasible manner to 145 lbs., 25 lbs. below the requirement, and proposed to deliver an additional torso concept that would increase the fit and mobility of the suit beyond what would be expected of a normal hard upper torso suit, while further allowing for mission or task specific mobility optimization. I found this to be of significant value.

In assessing the Cost/Price, I agreed with the SLPT that both Offeror's proposed cost were fair and reasonable.

### **Final Decision**

The relative importance of trade-off evaluation factors was as follows:

Past Performance is more important than the combined value of the Predefined Value Characteristics. The Predefined Value Characteristics are considered of equal value to one another. Past Performance and Predefined Value Characteristics, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

In making my decision, I found that there were material discriminators in Past Performance and Value Characteristics that were significantly more important than Cost and therefore offers the best value to the Government. ILC's Past Performance provides the Government with a high level of confidence that they will successfully perform the work required under the contract and those Value Characteristics proposed. As a result of this assessment, I select ILC Dover for the Advanced Space Suit for High Fidelity Testing contract.

The Contracting Officer has determined that ILC Dover is eligible in accordance with FAR 9.104. Therefore, in accordance with the RFP statement that the Government will award to the Offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government that meets all solicitation requirements, I find the proposal submitted by ILC Dover is the best value to the Government and select ILC Dover to perform the Z-2 contract.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert T. LaBrier  
Source Selection Authority

4/16/13  
Date