Source Selection Statement for the NASA Research Education Support Service (NRESS) Solicitation Number NNH13465022R

On September 29, 2015, I, Leigh Anne Giraldi, along with senior officials from NASA Headquarters (HQ) and NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the NASA Research Education Support Service (NRESS) acquisition. A full briefing of the results of the evaluation conducted by the SEB was presented to me, resulting in this source selection decision.

Procurement Description

The purpose of the NRESS contract is to fund intramural and extramural research and technology development, along with competitive education program opportunities, primarily through solicited, peer-reviewed proposals that result in grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, or intergovernmental agreements. Solicitation mechanisms include NASA Research Announcements (NRAs), Announcements of Opportunity (AOs), and Cooperative Agreement Notices (CANs). NASA also accepts and considers a small number of unsolicited proposals each year.

The life-cycle of the Agency's peer review program, for purposes of NRESS requirements, consists of the following general processes: (1) development and solicitation of proposals; (2) proposal review; and (3) disposition of proposals following proposal review and prior to award. All decisions about proposals selected for award are made by NASA selection officials and all awards are made by authorized NASA procurement personnel.

The NRESS Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on January 9, 2014. A total of three (3) Amendments to the RFP were released as follows:

> Amendment 1: Revised Section B.1, Section H.10, Section J.1, Section L.17, Section M.3, Attachment A, Cost Exhibit 1A, and Proposal Exhibit 16.
>
> Amendment 2; Revised Section L.17.
>
> Amendment 3: Revised Section L.17, Cost Exhibits 1A, 1B and 7. Added new Cost Exhibit 20.

The resultant contract will be a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with an effective ordering period of five (5) years, with no options. A separately priced, Firm Fixed Price, purchase order for the 45-day phase-in period will be issued.

This procurement was conducted as a Small Business 8(a) Set–Aside competition under NAICS Code 561110: Office Administration Services. The small business size standard is $ 7 million. The maximum ordering value inclusive of fee for this procurement, is $130,000,000.

Proposals Submitted

On March 7, 2014, NASA received seven timely proposals from the following companies:

Arctic Slope Technical Services Inc. (ASTS)
Bizzell Group Solutions (BGS)
Beacon Systems
Logical Diverse Business Innovations (LDBI)
Quality Assurance & Risk Management Services Inc (QARMS)
Tech Alliance
Voxcela

Beacon Systems proposal was determined unacceptable and not evaluated.

Evaluation Procedures

The NRESS SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15.3 "Source Selection," and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, NASA Source Evaluation Boards, were applied.

The RFP listed three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of these factors as follows:

> The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor.
>
> As individual Factors, the Past Performance Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Cost Factor.

Mission Suitability has three Subfactors as follows: Subfactor A, Technical Approach; Subfactor B, Information Technology Requirements; and Subfactor C, Management Approach. The available points for each subfactor are set forth below.

Subfactor A	Technical Approach	400
Subfactor B	Information Technology Requirement	250
Subfactor C	Management Approach	350

The Mission Suitability subfactors and the total Mission Suitability factor were evaluated using the adjectival ratings, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The

maximum points available for each subfactor were multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor.

The proposed costs of the Government Pricing Model and the rates proposed in Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Award Matrices, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). Offerors were referred to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of "cost realism" and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "Cost realism analysis" and "probable cost." Both the "proposed and probable cost" reflected the Offeror's proposed fee amount. Proposed fee was not adjusted in the probable cost assessment.

Past Performance evaluations were based on FAR Part 15 and were conducted in accordance with provision M.5 of the solicitation. As stated in provision M.5, all past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated. An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition.

An Offeror's Past Performance was assigned an overall confidence rating that reflects a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references. As set forth and described in Section M.5 of the RFP, the applicable level of confidence ratings were: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral.

For purposes of past performance, the term "Offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant subcontractor(s) was also evaluated and attributed to the Offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor was compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the Offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor was weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

Detailed Results of the Evaluation

As a result of the evaluation process, the Mission Suitability Subfactor ratings and Total Score are summarized below:

Offeror	Subfactor A	Subfactor B	Subfactor C	Total Score
ASTS	Very Good	Good	Good	747
BGS	Fair	Good	Good	505
LDBI	Fair	Good	Good	552
QARMS	Fair	Poor	Poor	251
Tech Alliance	Poor	Good	Good	417
Voxcela	Fair	Good	Good	573

Mission Suitability Factor

ASTS

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

ASTS received one (1) significant strength and one (1) strength, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

ASTS received one (1) significant strength based on a detailed response to investigate new and evolutionary information technology, including software, capabilities and services to enhance performance, quality, or cost effectiveness. The use of the proposed NASA Solicitation and Proposal Integrated Review and Evaluation System (NSPIRES) integrated panel collaboration tool and the proposed social media platforms are exceptional enhancements to the NRESS contractual requirements and processes that could significantly increase the efficiency and expanded use of virtual forums, rather than traditional in-person execution of peer review panel meetings and increase the use of evolving social media to share and exchange information among the peer review communities. ASTS' well thought-out innovative enhancements greatly improves the potential for successful contract performance.

ASTS received one (1) strength for proposing a solid approach for new or evolutionary architectures. This enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

No findings were received for ASTS under subfactor B, however ASTS' proposal demonstrated a reasonably sound response that results in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

ASTS received one (1) strength resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

ASTS received one (1) strength for a task order management tool to facilitate and track task orders from inception to closeout. This strength enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

BGS

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

BGS received one (1) significant weakness and seven (7) weaknesses, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

BGS significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to adequately address Representative Task Order (RTO) 2 - NASA Research Announcement (NRA) requirement for virtual participation and panel collaboration of NRESS panel members. The NRA calls for half of the panelists to participate virtually, the absences of a viable approach to ensure virtual panel members full participation and collaboration on document development, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

BGS received seven (7) weaknesses in the following areas: 1) inadequate approach to accomplish virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTO 1- Announcement of Opportunity (AO); 2) an unclear and ambiguous representation of RTO 1 projected hours; 3) an unclear and ambiguous representation of RTO 2- NRA projected hours; 4) ineffective mitigation of RTO 1- AO identified risks; 5) ineffective identification and mitigation of RTO 2 – NRA risks; 6) ambiguous RTO 2 - NRA staffing strategy link to technical approach; and 7) ambiguous RTO 1 - AO staffing strategy link to technical approach. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

BGS received one (1) strength resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

BGS received one (1) strength for benchmarking the functional user requirements of RTO 3 – Information Technology (IT) Support Assessment for Peer Review. This strength enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

BGS received one (1) weakness for subfactor C. As a whole this weakness, not off-set by strengths, did not significantly detract from BGS's overall response to the subfactor and results in an adjectival rating of Good.

BGS received one (1) weakness for an inadequate phase-in plan which failed to account for the movement of personnel to its new facility. This weakness increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

LDBI

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

LDBI received two (2) strengths, four (4) weaknesses, and one (1) significant weakness, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

LDBI received two (2) strengths in the following areas: 1) a favorable approach for using applications of existing Information Technology to improve the panel review process; and 2) a solid approach to investigating new or evolutionary Information Technology that focuses on innovative use of appropriate technology tools. These strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance

LDBI significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to adequately address RTO 2 - NRA requirement for virtual participation and panel collaboration of NRESS panel members. The NRA calls for half of the panelists to participate virtually, the absences of a viable approach to ensure virtual panel members full participation and collaboration on document development, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

LDBI received four (4) weaknesses in the following areas: 1) inadequate approach to accomplish virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTO 1 – AO; 2) incomplete staffing strategy for failure to include an Export Control Officer, IT Manger and Logistics Analyst Jr. for RTO 1 – AO; 3) insufficient labor hours to adequately implement RTO 1- AO; and 4) an incomplete staffing strategy for failure to include an IT Manager for RTO 2 – NRA. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

LDBI received two (2) strengths and three (3) weaknesses, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

LDBI received two (2) strengths in the following areas: 1) a solid approach for an NSPIRES stakeholder analysis for RTO 3 – IT Support Assessment for Peer Review; and 2) a solid approach for RTO 3's architectural Assessment. These strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

LDBI received three (3) weaknesses in the following areas: 1) ambiguous RTO 3 staffing strategy link to technical approach; 2) inadequate recognition of RTO 3 and Statement of Work

(SOW) 7.0 technical problems and critical issues; and 3) a lack of understanding SOW 7.7 approval process. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

LDBI received one (1) strength and one (1) weakness, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

LDBI received one (1) strength for a task order management tool to manage and facilitate the total task order processing activity. This enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

LDBI received one (1) weakness for an inconsistent staffing plan which discusses the activities for a specific labor position but failed to include the hours and cost associated with the position. This weakness increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

QARMS

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

QARMS received one (1) significant weakness and nine (9) weaknesses, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor

QARMS significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to adequately address RTO 2 – NRA requirement for virtual participation and panel collaboration of NRESS panel members. The NRA calls for half of the panelists to participate virtually, the absences of a viable approach to ensure virtual panel members full participation and collaboration on document development, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

QARMS received nine (9) weaknesses in the following areas: 1) inadequate approach to accomplish virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTO 1 – AO; 2) unclear staffing strategy and unsubstantiated use of labor hours for RTO 1- AO; 3) inadequate approach to implementing RTO 1 – AO arrangement of venue selection; 4) unclear and inadequate staffing strategy for SOW 6.0 elements; 5) inadequate approach for demonstrating an understanding or recognition of SOW 6.0 Government Interface; 6) inadequate recognition and identification of SOW 6.0 technical problems, critical issues, risk and risk mitigation; 7) inadequate and unrealistic approach for solicitation planning of RTO 1 – AO and RTO 2 – NRA; 8) ambiguous RTO 2 staffing strategy link to technical approach; and 9) inadequate and unreasonable identification of RTO 1 risk and risk mitigation. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

QARMS received one (1) weakness and one (1) deficiency, resulting in an adjectival rating of Poor for this subfactor.

QARMS received one (1) weakness for an unclear staffing strategy and unsubstantiated use of labor hours for RTO 3. This weakness increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

QARMS received one (1) deficiency for an inadequate response to SOW 7.0 (Information Technology), the response was generic in nature often paraphrasing the SOW requirements without providing adequate context and detail. The proposal also failed to provide a response to SOW 7.0 evaluation criteria for staffing strategy, skill mix, identification of technical problems and critical issues, identification of risk and risk mitigation, and identification of Government interface. The inadequate response to SOW 7.0 technical approach and the absences of a response to multiple evaluation criteria to this critical SOW function, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

QARMS received one (1) significant weakness resulting in an adjectival rating of Poor for this subfactor.

QARMS received one (1) significant weakness based on an incomplete phase-in plan that lacked critical details of the tasks that needed to be performed and included: ambiguous Program Management duties, reference to a missing Transition Plan, no listing of end-to end schedule activities, and no clear identification of the location or the approach used to put in place the primary work facility. Failure to address these activities at the critical junction of contract phase-in, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

<u>Tech Alliance</u>

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

Tech Alliance received three (3) significant weaknesses and seven (7) weaknesses, resulting in an adjectival rating of Poor for this subfactor.

Tech Alliance's first significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to recognize NSPIRES as an important area where significant potential problems, critical issues and risk can occur on RTO 2- NRA. Due to the magnitude and size of the NRA, failure to recognize NSPIRES as a risk and identify appropriate mitigation, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Tech Alliance's second significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to recognize the need to adhere to Export Control regulations during the execution of RTO 1- AO which calls for the involvement of a NASA foreign partner. Failure to recognize Export Control requirements appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Tech Alliance's third significant weakness was based on the proposal's failure to adequately address RTO 2 –NRA requirement for virtual participation and panel collaboration of NRESS panel members. The NRA calls for half of the panelists to participate virtually, the absences of a viable approach to ensure virtual panel members full participation and collaboration on document development, appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Tech Alliance received seven (7) weakness in the following areas: 1) insufficient labor hours for the IT position on RTO 1 – AO; 2) insufficient labor hours for the IT position on RTO 2 – NRA; 3) inadequate approach to obtaining the involvement of the Jet Propulsion Lab (JPL) specialist on RTO 1 – AO; 4) failure to identify NSPIRES risk and risk mitigation on RTO 1 – AO; 5) inaccurate assumption of the percentage of local government personnel attendance, resulting in the underestimation of RTO 2 – NRA logistics requirements; 6) inadequate approach to accomplish virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTO 1 – AO; and 7) inadequate approach to implementing RTO 1- AO Notice of Intent receipts requirements. These weaknesses increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

Tech Alliance received one (1) weakness for subfactor B. As a whole this weakness, not off-set by strengths, did not significantly detract from Tech Alliance's overall response to the subfactor and results in an adjectival rating of Good.

Tech Alliance received one (1) weakness for a proposed staffing strategy with insufficient labor hours applied to RTO 3. This increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

No findings were received for Tech Alliance under subfactor C, however Tech Alliance's proposal demonstrated a reasonably sound response that results in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

<u>Voxcela</u>

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

Voxcela received one (1) strength and three (3) weaknesses, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

Voxcela received one (1) strength for proposing a solid approach for new or evolutionary information technology. This enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Voxcela received three (3) weaknesses in the following areas: 1) inconsistent staffing strategy and insufficient labor hours for RTO 1 – AO; 2) inadequate approach to accomplish virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTO 1 - AO; and 3) inadequate approach to accomplish panel collaboration for RTO 2 – NRA. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Information Technology Requirements

Voxcela received one (1) strength for a sound approach to RTO 3, resulting in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Voxcela received one (1) strength for a solid approach for assessing NSPIRES capabilities and functional requirements. This enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Subfactor C: Management Approach

No findings were received for Voxcela under subfactor C, however Voxcela's proposal demonstrated a reasonably sound response that results in an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor.

Cost Factor

Upward or downward adjustments were made to the proposed costs based on the Offeror's approach, DCAA's analysis and input, and the SEB's evaluation of the appropriate probable cost as a result of the assessment of cost realism. Based on the above, the evaluation team made direct labor and indirect costs adjustments to all Offerors resulting in minor cost adjustments to ASTS and LDBI, and moderate adjustments to BGS, Tech Alliance, QARMS and Voxcela. The results of the SEB's probable cost analysis, from the lowest probable cost dollars to the highest, are as follows: BGS, Tech Alliance, Voxcela, LDBI, QARMS, and ASTS. The probable costs for BGS, Tech Alliance, and Voxcela were slightly lower than the probable costs for LDBI, QUARMS, and ASTS.

Past Performance Factor

The NRESS Source Evaluation Board made a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references. Based on the SEB's past performance evaluation, the SEB assigned an overall level of confidence rating to each Offeror, as shown below:

Past Performance Level of Confidence	
Offeror	**Rating**
ASTS	High
BGS	High
LDBI	Very High
QARMS	Low
Tech Alliance	Moderate
Voxcela	Moderate

ASTS

ASTS was assigned an overall confidence level rating of High. The overall relevance of ASTS's reference contracts was rated low to high with overall performance rated very high. The significant subcontractors demonstrated moderate to very high relevance with performance ratings of high to very high. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a High level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

BGS

BGS was assigned an overall confidence level rating of High. The overall relevance of BGS's reference contracts was rated low to high with overall performance rated primarily high. The significant subcontractor demonstrated low to very high relevance with performance ratings of primarily very high. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a High level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

LDBI

LDBI was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Very High. The overall relevance of LDBI's reference contracts was rated low to very high with overall performance rated primarily very high. LDBI did not propose significant subcontractor support; therefore significant subcontractor past performance was not evaluated. Based on the Offeror's performance record,

there is a Very High level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

QARMS

QARMS was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Low. The overall relevance of QARMS' reference contracts was rated low with overall performance rated very high. The significant subcontractors demonstrated low to moderate relevance with performance ratings of primarily very high. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a Low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Tech Alliance

Tech Alliance was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Moderate. The overall relevance of Tech Alliance's reference contracts was rated low to moderate with overall performance rated high to very high. The significant subcontractor demonstrated moderate relevance with performance ratings of primarily very high. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a Moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Voxcela

Voxcela was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Moderate. The overall relevance of Voxcela's reference contract was rated low to moderate with overall performance rated primarily very high. The significant subcontractor demonstrated low to very high relevance with performance ratings of very high. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a Moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Decision

As the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this procurement, I carefully reviewed the Source Evaluation Board's documentation entitled "Presentation to the Source Selection Authority, NASA Research Education Support Service (NRESS) Procurement." On September 29, 2015, I met with the NRESS Source Evaluation Board (SEB), along with several ex-officio members, to hear the SEB's findings and evaluation. I determined that the findings presented by the SEB, as documented in its presentation and the accompanying "NRESS Cost Evaluation Report" were detailed, consistent with the evaluation criteria in the NRESS RFP, and provided a clear description of the merits of each proposal. I discussed with the SEB its rationale for the findings and the adjectival ratings and scores for the mission suitability subfactors, and also discussed the rationale for the evaluation of cost and past performance. Further, I solicited the views of ex-officio members in their areas of expertise. I determined that the findings were reasonable and

valid for the purpose of making a selection decision. I accept the findings from the SEB and concur with the Contracting Officer that a competitive range determination and discussions are not necessary.

In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP.

> "The Cost/Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Past Performance Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Cost Factor."

Regarding the Mission Suitability Factor, I noted that the total Mission Suitability scores for QARMS and Tech Alliance was considerably lower than that of ASTS, BGS, LDBI and Voxcela. I also noted that QARMS and Tech Alliance's proposals contained multiple significant weaknesses which made their proposals less competitive in the Mission Suitability Factor. Further, these two proposals did not have significant Cost or Past Performance advantages to offset the significant Mission Suitability advantages of the ASTS, BGS, LDBI, and Voxcela proposals. Therefore, the remainder of my decision focused on the four most competitive proposals, ASTS, BGS, LDBI and Voxcela.

For Subfactor A – Technical Approach, I noted that ASTS was the only Offeror with a Very Good rating and that BGS, LDBI and Voxcela each received a rating of Fair. I further noted that within Subfactor A, ASTS was the only Offeror with a Significant Strength as well the only Offeror with no weaknesses while BGS, LDBI, and Voxcela received multiple weaknesses. ASTS' significant strength along with the absence of weaknesses was a significant discriminator for this subfactor. I noted that ASTS' significant strength for its detailed approach to investigate the development of a panel collaboration tool that would significantly increase the efficiency and enhance use of both in-person and virtual meetings for participants on NRESS panels. . In contrast, BGS and LDBI both received a weakness and significant weakness for virtual participation and panel collaboration for RTOs 1 and 2 respectively; and Voxcela received a weakness for virtual participation and panel collaboration (RTO 1) and a weakness for panel collaboration (RTO 2). I found the presence of weaknesses in BGS, LDBI and Voxcela's responses to both RTO's requirement for virtual participation and panel collaboration, detracted from each Offeror's overall Technical Approach. I found ASTS' significant strength to be a discriminator as ASTS was the only Offeror to demonstrate a comprehensive and overall understanding of the subfactor.

For Subfactor B - Information Technology Requirement, I did not find any discernable discriminators between the proposals from ASTS, BGS, LDBI and Voxcela.

For Subfactor C – Management Approach, I did not find any discernable discriminators between the proposals from ASTS, BGS, LDBI and Voxcela.

Regarding the Cost evaluation, I noted that there was no discernable discriminators between the probable costs of ASTS and LDBI, and that BGS and Voxcela held a slight competitive edge in its probable cost.

Regarding the Past Performance evaluation, I noted that Voxcela received a Moderate Level of Confidence rating, ASTS and BGS received a High Level of Confidence rating, and LDBI received a Very High Level of Confidence rating.

Finally, I carefully considered the findings in relation to the evaluation criteria in the RFP, and exercised my independent judgment regarding the significance of the findings as discriminators between the proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria in the RFP. While the proposals from BGS, LDBI and Voxcela were somewhat competitive, the ASTS proposal presented a considerable technical advantage. Its Mission Suitability evaluation, particularly the Subfactor A significant strength and lack of weaknesses, showed unique insight and understanding of the technical problems and the theme presented repetitively throughout the RTOs and SOW, for virtual participation and panel collaboration. ASTS's considerable Mission Suitability Factor advantage, the most important factor, more than offsets LDBI's past performance advantage, and BGS' and Voxcela's slight probable cost advantage. ASTS's strong technical approach and Mission Suitability rating, along with its competitive Cost and Past Performance rating presents the best overall value to the Government. In view of the preceding discussion, and in light of the evaluation factors, I select ASTS for award of the NRESS contract.

Leigh Anne Giraldi
Source Selection Authority