

Source Selection Statement

Space Flight Systems Development and Operations Contract II
(SpaceDOC II)
NNC13ZMA015R

Procurement History/Description

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Glenn Research Center (GRC) implements several space-related programs within the Space Flight Systems Directorate (SFSD). The GRC has space flight development responsibility for the Orion service and crew module, numerous microgravity research investigations on the International Space Station (ISS) and launch vehicles, ISS power system, human research projects, space flight technology developments, and demonstrations of advanced power, propulsion, communications and other systems, and the potential for space science instrumentation packages.

The Space Flight Systems Development and Operations Contract (SpaceDOC II) requires end-item deliverables through performance-based activities in the definition, design, development, analysis, fabrication, assembly, test, verification, delivery, operation and/or sustaining engineering of space flight systems and technology developments. Services will primarily be performed at the contractor's facility as well as the GRC's Lewis Field located in Cleveland, Ohio. The SpaceDOC II is a follow-on contract to SpaceDOC I NNC09BA02B.

SpaceDOC II is being awarded as a single-contract effort consisting of five base work tasks, plus an indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) delivery order effort. The base, as well as the IDIQ portion of the effort, is Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) contract type. The total anticipated period of performance will be for 7 years 9 months (ending 9/30/2021.)

Base		IDIQ
Task #	Title	Delivery Orders
1	Fluids and Combustion Facility (FCF) Sustaining Engineering and Operations	
2	Acceleration Measurement Project (AMP) Operations and Development	
3	Combustion Integration Rack (CIR) Inserts	
4	Space Communications and Navigation (SCaN) Testbed	
5	Exploration Technology and Flight Development (ET&FD) (NON-EVALUATED)	

A sources sought notice was issued on January 9, 2013. A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on April 2, 2013. On April 16, 2013, an Industry Day was held with multiple potential offerors in attendance. The Final Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on May 31, 2013, as a Small Business Set-Aside.

The two proposals were received on July 31, 2013. After an initial review, both were considered acceptable and included in the formal evaluation process. The proposals were submitted by:

- Enterprise Advisory Services, Inc (Easi)
- ZIN Technologies, Inc. (ZIN)

Evaluation Procedures

The proposals were evaluated by a designated Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with the 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 numerically scored. The subfactor weighting is indicated below:

Mission Suitability (1,000 points TOTAL)

A. Understanding Technical Requirements (UR) (250 points)

- UR1 Understanding the Technical and Engineering Requirements
- UR2 Coordination between Government, Contractor, and PIs
- UR3 Contractor Base Tasks and Sample Delivery Order Work Plans for Four Base Tasks and Two Sample Delivery Orders

B. Management Plan and Approach (MP) (350 points)

- MP1 Contract Transition
- MP2 Organizational Structure and Relationships
- MP3 Base Tasks and Delivery Order Execution
- MP4 Project Management
- MP5 Property Management
- MP6 Management Approach for Four Base Tasks and Two Sample Delivery Orders

C. Product Assurance (150 points)

- PA1 Safety, Health, and Environmental Management
- PA2 Product Assurance
- PA3 Continuous Risk Management

PA4 Product Assurance, Safety, and Risk Management Approaches for Four Base Tasks and Two Sample Delivery Orders

D. Key Personnel (150 points)

KP1 Key Personnel for Organization Structure

KP2 Key Personnel for Four Base Tasks and Two Sample Delivery Orders

E. Corporate Resources (100 points)

CR1 Financial Resources

CR2 Human Resources and Staff Development

CR3 Office Facilities and Computer Resources

CR4 Fabrication, Assembly, Test, and Laboratory Facilities

The Relevant Experience and Past Performance factor was evaluated to determine the relevancy to the work effort, considering items such as the contract scope, type of client, contract type, contract size, type of services, and recency of the contract. If the Government received negative past performance information, the offeror was provided the opportunity to rebut the information. In such an instance, the SEB considered the offeror's rebuttal information in determining the past performance rating. This 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 cost realism analysis was performed. Adjustments were made as appropriate to establish probable costs.

When considering the evaluation factors identified above for purposes of selecting a contract awardee, mission suitability is considered approximately equal in importance to past performance, which is approximately equal to cost. The mission suitability plus past performance, when combined, are significantly more important than cost.

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. The price analyst then provided its results to all voting members of the SEB for review and discussion.

The government had developed an independent government cost estimate (IGCE) prior to the release of the RFP.

Clarification questions were asked and received in accordance with FAR 15.306.

The award was based off of initial proposals. A competitive range was not established.

Enterprise Advisory Services, Inc (Easi)

Mission Suitability Factor - 329 Points

In the Understanding the Technical & Engineering Requirements subfactor; The proposal was rated "Poor". From the proposal, no strengths, one weakness, and one significant weakness were identified. The weakness relates to the offeror's contractor work plans. The significant weakness was as follows: The Easi work plans consistently failed to demonstrate an overall understanding of the scope for the individual project base tasks and delivery orders (BT/DO), and lacked credible planning, due to vague, generic, and/or incomplete approaches.

In the Management Plan and Approach Subfactor; The proposal was rated "Fair". From the proposal, one strength, six weaknesses, and two significant weaknesses were identified. The strength related to Easi's approach to attract work for others. The weaknesses relate to Easi's potential organizational conflict of interest, management structure, interfaces with the government, method of tracking cost and schedule, configuration management approach, and cost realism for the six base tasks/delivery orders. The significant weaknesses were as follows 1.) Easi's transition plans for the transfer of existing documentation, transfer of existing property, and preparation of facilities are insufficient. 2.) Easi proposes an inadequate and incomplete property management approach, including the processes and systems for hardware tracking.

In the Product Assurance Subfactor; The proposal was rated "Fair". From the proposal, no strengths and seven weaknesses were identified. The weaknesses related to the offeror's offsite safety approach, onsite safety, demonstrated understanding of safety hazards, AS9100 certification, parts selection approach, bonded storage, and risk management approach.

In the Key Personnel Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Fair”. From the proposal, no strengths and one weakness was identified. The weakness related to the program manager’s experience.

In the Corporate Resources Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Poor”. From the proposal, no strengths, one weakness, and one significant weakness were identified. The weakness related to the offeror’s proposed primary office facilities. The significant weakness was as follows: Easi's plan for fabrication, assembly, test, and laboratory facilities is inadequate for the successful execution of SpaceDOC II work.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: “Moderate Level of Confidence”.

The Easi team had one strength identified for the proposed prime contractor related to a contract similar in size and scope, which was considered highly relevant to the SpaceDOC II contract. The Easi team had one strength and one weakness identified for its major subcontractors related to contracts of similar size and scope, which was considered highly relevant to the SpaceDOC II contract.

Cost/Price Factor

The proposed and probable costs were significantly higher than ZIN’s proposed and probable cost and somewhat higher than the Government’s independent cost estimate. A minor cost adjustment was made in the area of productive labor hours.

ZIN Technologies, Inc.

Mission Suitability Factor - 840 Points

In the Understanding the Technical & Engineering Requirements Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Excellent”. From the proposal, no weaknesses, two strengths, and four significant strengths were identified. The strengths related to the offeror’s understanding of the operational constraints and its proposed approach to coordinating operations with the government. The significant strengths were as follows: 1.) ZIN's proposal demonstrates an excellent understanding of the space environment, use and integration of space vehicles, and constraints imposed upon payload for launch, shipping, and ground processing. 2.) ZIN's proposal demonstrates a comprehensive and thorough understanding of NASA's project management and systems engineering processes (NPR 7120.5, NPR 7120.8 and NPR 7123.1), along with their interactions for flight systems and technology development. 3.) ZIN provided an exceptional communications approach to facilitate interactions between the contractor's development team and the government. 4.) The ZIN contractor work plans consistently demonstrate an exceptional understanding of the scope for the individual project BT/DO, with clearly credible planning, as evidenced by their detailed, specific, comprehensive, and effective project approaches that are reflective of the various phases of the space flight hardware development lifecycle.

In the Management Plan and Approach Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Very Good”. From the proposal, no weaknesses, three strengths, and two significant strengths were identified. The strengths related to ZIN’s proposed base task/delivery order execution, it’s method of tracking cost and schedule, and it’s overall approach to property management. The significant strengths were as follows: 1.) ZIN defined an outstanding, comprehensive, detailed, and credible transition plan, which addressed all the relevant aspects of transition to SpaceDOC II. 2.) ZIN's organizational structure provides a very strong management approach, with clear lines of authority for the corporate and project management, and includes an effective approach to interacting with the government.

In the Product Assurance Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Good”. From the proposal, four strengths and one weakness were identified. The strengths related to the proposed approach for personnel safety training and certification, its understanding of implementing a highly cost-effective safety and mission assurance program, its AS9100 certification program, and overall risk mitigation approach. The weakness pertained to the proposed onsite safety approach.

In the Key Personnel Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Very Good”. From the proposal, no weaknesses, one strength, and one significant strength were identified. The strength pertained to the proposed key personnel on the six base tasks and delivery orders. The significant strength was as follows: ZIN has identified extremely strong candidates for key personnel positions which demonstrates appreciation for the value of a strong management team in leading the broad scope of work under SpaceDOC II.

In the Corporate Resources Subfactor; The proposal was rated “Good”. No strengths or weaknesses were identified.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated: “Very High Level of Confidence”.

The ZIN team had three strengths and one significant strength identified for the proposed prime contractor related to a contract similar in size and scope, which was considered highly relevant to the SpaceDOC II contract. The strengths related to the proposed prime contractor’s management experience, product assurance experience, and the major subcontractor’s past performance on contracts similar to SpaceDOC II. The significant strength is as follows: ZIN has identified extremely strong candidates for key personnel positions which demonstrates appreciation for the value of a strong management team in leading the broad scope of work under SpaceDOC II. The ZIN team had one strength identified for its major subcontractors related to contracts of similar size and scope, which was considered highly relevant to the SpaceDOC II contract.

Cost/Price Factor

The proposal cost and probable cost were significantly lower than Easi’s proposed and probable costs and somewhat lower than the government’s independent cost estimate. No probable cost adjustments were made.

Source Selection Presentation

I held a source selection presentation meeting on September 16, 2013. In addition to me, all voting, SEB members, and several key senior GRC management officials attended. A copy of the presentation was provided to me in advance of the presentation. As a result, I had reviewed all the slides including every finding for both offerors prior to the presentation. During the meeting, the overall evaluation process, and the SEB's findings evaluations of the two offerors were presented and discussed in detail.

A follow-on "executive session" was held immediately following the presentation to finalize the selection decision. In attendance were the source selection authority, several key senior GRC management officials, and key SEB members. The SEB members responded to questions and the key findings were reviewed and discussed.

Selection Decision

Based on the information presented, I fully understand the evaluation process, the SEB findings, and concur with the overall SEB results. I understand that the three evaluation factors were approximately equal in weighting in determining the best value for the government. I also understand that mission suitability and relevant experience past performance when combined, are significantly more important than cost.

Initially, I considered the SEB's evaluation and my judgment for the mission suitability factor. While I have evaluated and agree with all of the SEB's evaluation findings for this factor, I am particularly impressed with the significant strength ZIN received for its comprehensive and integrated understanding of NASA's project management systems and engineering processes. I agree that such a demonstrated understanding in the proposal is of significant value to NASA GRC because the NASA procedures and management systems are critical drivers in the flight hardware development cycle and a detailed understanding of them is vital to successful contract implementation.

Likewise, I find the board's significant strength finding in the area of ZIN's proposed management structure, interfaces with the government and work for others approach offers a meaningful advantage to the government. ZIN's proposal in this area provided for clear lines of communications, responsibilities, and appropriate spans of control for the proposed positions. SpaceDOC II will be the Center's primary instrument for delivering critical spaceflight hardware to NASA and our international partners. As such, it's imperative that there be a strong integration between the contractor's management and workforce and its NASA peers. ZIN's proposed approach increases my confidence that it will be able to successfully implement the work and resolve cost, schedule, and technical issues in an appropriate manner. In contrast, the Easi proposal received numerous weaknesses associated with its proposed management plan and approach. Specifically, the proposal received weaknesses for its proposed interfaces with the government, management and corporate structure, and approach to tracking cost and schedule issues. If the selected SpaceDOC II contractor experienced difficulties in these crucial areas, it could result in cost growth and schedule delays on critical spaceflight hardware. These key

distinctions between the two proposals reinforced my determination that ZIN's proposal was significantly stronger for the Mission Suitability factor.

I agreed with the board's determination that ZIN's proposal demonstrated better overall past performance than Easi's proposal. I agreed with the SEB's finding that ZIN demonstrated strong relevant past performance and excellent performance on Government contracts similar in size and scope to SpaceDoc II. Such demonstrated past performance reinforces my confidence that ZIN can successfully perform the requirements of the contract.

Finally, in the area of cost, I asked several detailed questions regarding each offeror's proposed cost information. After I was satisfied that the SEB and I fully understood the cost information, I agreed with the board's determination that ZIN's proposal was realistic and represents a significant savings over the proposed and probable cost of Easi's proposal.

In summary, I consider ZIN to have provided a superior proposal in all three areas: mission suitability, relevant experience and past performance, and cost.

In considering these three factors, with the understanding that all three factors are approximately equal in importance, and mission suitability plus past performance, when combined, are significantly more important than cost, I have determined that the ZIN proposal represents the best value to the government and hereby select ZIN Technologies, Inc. to perform the Space Flight Systems Development and Operations Contract II as outlined in the request for proposal NNC13ZMA015R.



Gregory L. Robinson
Deputy Director, Glenn Research Center
Source Selection Authority