

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) Flight Critical Systems Research (FCSR) Contract Request for Proposal (RFP) Number NNL13451174R

On May 20, 2013, I, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the FCSR acquisition, met with the Source Evaluation Team (SET) appointed to evaluate proposals for the FCSR acquisition. The SET presented its findings to me in a formal source selection briefing.

Background

The purpose of the FCSR contract is to support basic and applied research, technology development, systems analyses, and systems integration in airborne and ground-based systems critical to flight safety, management and control. All work assignments under this contract(s) will be made by the issuance of Task Orders (TOs).

Market research was conducted in order to determine the level of existing small business capabilities. On August 23, 2012, a sources-sought synopsis was issued on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and the Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) website seeking capability statements from potential sources under NAICS code 541712, Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (Except Biotechnology) with a size standard of 1,500 employees. Based on the responses received, the Contracting Officer (CO), with the concurrence of the Small Business Specialist and the Small Business Administration (SBA) Procurement Center Representative determined that an adequate number of small business concerns did not exist to allow the FCSR procurement to be conducted as a Total Small Business set-aside. Therefore, the FCSR acquisition was conducted as a full and open competition.

The SSA appointed the LaRC SET on September 27, 2012 to evaluate the proposals received in response to the RFP. A Procurement Strategy Meeting was held on November 13, 2012 at LaRC and the procurement strategy was subsequently approved. The RFP was released on December 19, 2012.

The FCSR procurement was solicited as a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ), Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee effort with a five-year period of performance with a two-year base period of performance, and three one-year option periods of performance. The total maximum cumulative value of all the IDIQ contracts issued is not to exceed \$9.5M.

The following four "Prime" Offerors (listed in alphabetical order) submitted proposals in response to the RFP and all proposals were received on or before the due date of February 19, 2013:

Offeror	Prime Offeror	Subcontractor(s)
1	The Boeing Company (Boeing)	Georgia Institute of Technology Rockwell Collins, Inc.
2	Honeywell International, Inc. (Honeywell)	Galois, Inc. Kestrel Technology, LLC Mosaic ATM, Inc. Ridgetop Group, Inc. Safeware Engineering Corporation
3	Rockwell Collins, Inc. (Rockwell)	None
4	Saab Sensis Corporation (Saab)	AeroControl, Inc. Calspan Corporation Cognitive Systems Engineering, Inc. Metron Aviation, Inc.

Evaluation Factors

This best value source selection was conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 15. The appointed SET conducted an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in Section M of the RFP. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

- Factor 1: Past Performance
- Factor 2: Price
- Factor 3: Small Business Utilization

The RFP stated that the contract would be awarded to the offerors whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Utilization. The RFP also stated that it is anticipated that award will be made without discussions. The RFP provided for two evaluation approaches. In the primary approach, the RFP stated that a tradeoff process (see FAR 15.101-1) would be performed between the factors of past performance, price, and small business utilization. Overall, in the selection of an offeror for contract award, the Past Performance Factor was significantly more important than the Price Factor in importance. The Price Factor was somewhat more important than the Small Business Utilization Factor.

The RFP also allowed for the use of alternative evaluation procedures identified in NFS 1815.305-71(b). According to the NFS, these procedures would apply if “the number of proposals received equals the number of awards contemplated.” For FCSR, the market research and procurement strategy contemplated up to five awards resulting from this multiple award solicitation.

Therefore, the CO determined that the procedures at NFS 1815.305(a) applied as the number of responsive proposals was no more than the number of awards contemplated. As required by NFS 1815.305-71(b), the CO reviewed the solicitation and proposals received and determined that: (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive and (2) adequate price competition existed based on the receipt of multiple responsive and competitive proposals.

The CO's determination that the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive was based on the multiple offers received and the fact that there were no weaknesses identified in the proposals. Additionally, the volume of work performed under the current contract was analyzed and the findings confirmed that the solicitation was not flawed.

NFS 1815.305-71(a) also states that the CO shall determine if the proposals are acceptable. Accordingly, based on the determination made by the CO that all offerors submitted acceptable proposals, the SSA directed the CO to award after negotiating an acceptable contract (s). The SSA instructed the SET to evaluate and document their findings for each of the three factors (Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Utilization).

Factor 1 – Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor, the SET assessed each offeror's current/recent record of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation. Specifically, the RFP stated, "each of the adjective ratings has a "performance" component and a "pertinence" component. The offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing "performance," the Government made an assessment of each offeror's overall performance record and each significant subcontractor's overall performance record. The Government evaluated the offeror's and any significant subcontractors past performance record for meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, overall mission success, subcontracting goals, and other contract requirements. In assessing "pertinence," the Government considered the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity to the requirements in the solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance of each offeror and each significant subcontractor. The SET used confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

Factor 2 – Price

The RFP does not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Price Factor; however, the RFP provides evaluation language within Section M, as follows: The Government will conduct a price analysis by evaluating the prices proposed in response to the solicitation. Specifically, the evaluations will include, but are not limited to, comparing the prices proposed in response to the solicitation, comparing the proposed prices to historical prices for the same or similar items purchased by the Government, and comparing the proposed prices to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

Furthermore, in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d), the Government will conduct a cost realism analyses by independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the

work to be performed and reflect a clear understanding of the capabilities required to meet the Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements. The Government will derive a probable cost, which is determined by adjusting each offeror's proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analyses performed. The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of each offeror's proposal. The probable cost shall be used for the purposes of evaluation to determine the best value".

Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program applied to all offerors, except that small businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan was evaluated in terms of the offeror's proposed subcontracting goals in comparison to the CO's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals as stated in the RFP for the FCSR procurement. The offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan was also evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements. Additionally, offeror's commitment to the small business program was evaluated for strengths and weaknesses as appropriate, and was not adjectively rated or scored. In doing this NASA evaluated: 1) The extent to which any work performed by a small business as prime or subcontractor was identified as "high technology" and the commitment to utilize the small business(es) identified (i.e. enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments). 2) The extent to which the identity of small business subcontractors were specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use the small business(es) identified. 3) The offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and small business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures.

Evaluation Procedures and Findings

Proposals were evaluated for acceptability and responsiveness in accordance with the LaRC FCSR Evaluation Plan and RFP Section M. Proposals were then evaluated against the Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Utilization Factors.

A Competitive Range Determination was made on March 21, 2013 that included all four offerors. Negotiations were conducted with each offeror and the results, to include Final Proposal Revisions, were incorporated in the SET's findings, as presented below.

Factor 1 - Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor the SET evaluated each offerors' past performance records in accordance with provision M.4(a) of the RFP. The SET considered records of performing contracts similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements contained in the solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance of each offeror to include the record of any significant subcontractors. A confidence rating was assigned in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

Set forth below is a summary of the Past Performance Findings for the four offerors:

Offeror	Pertinence Component Rating	Performance Component Rating	Confidence Rating
Boeing	Very Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	Very High
Honeywell	Very Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	Very High
Rockwell	Very Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	Very High
Saab	Highly Pertinent	Exceptional	High

Boeing Team:

The SET determined that there is a “Very High Level of Confidence” that the Boeing team would be able to successfully perform the requirement of the FCSR contract based on its past performance record.

Pertinence: The SET consensus was that the Boeing team demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in all PWS areas with the exception of PWS area 4.3 Operational Integrity, in which pertinent performance was demonstrated. After considering the similarity in the size, the content across all PWS areas, and the similarity in complexity to the FCSR acquisition and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Pertinence Rating of “Very Highly Pertinent” for the Boeing team.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Boeing and its significant subcontractors by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Performance Rating of “Exceptional” for the Boeing team.

Honeywell Team:

The SET determined that there is a “Very High Level of Confidence” that the Honeywell team would be able to successfully perform the requirement of the FCSR contract based on its past performance record.

Pertinence: The SET consensus was that the Honeywell team demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in all PWS areas with the exception of PWS area 4.1, Safety-Critical Aviation Systems Design Integrity, in which highly pertinent performance was demonstrated. After considering the similarity in the size, the content across all PWS areas, and the similarity in complexity to the FCSR acquisition and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Pertinence Rating of “Very Highly Pertinent” for the Honeywell team.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Honeywell and its significant subcontractors by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Performance Rating of “Exceptional” for the Honeywell team.

Rockwell:

The SET determined that there is a “Very High Level of Confidence” that Rockwell would be able to successfully perform the requirement of the FCSR contract based on its past performance record.

Pertinence: The SET consensus was that Rockwell demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in all PWS areas with the exception of PWS areas 4.2 Systems Safety Assurance and 4.3 Operational Integrity, in which highly pertinent experience was demonstrated. After considering the similarity in the size, the content across all PWS areas, and the similarity in complexity to the FCSR acquisition and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Pertinence Rating of “Very Highly Pertinent” for Rockwell.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Rockwell by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Performance Rating of “Exceptional” for Rockwell.

Saab Team:

The SET determined that there is a “High Level of Confidence” that Saab team would be able to successfully perform the requirement of the FCSR contract based on its past performance record.

Pertinence: The SET consensus was that the Saab team demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in PWS area 3.1 Situation Awareness - Flight Crew, PWS area 3.2 Situation Awareness - Air Traffic Control, and PWS area 5.1 Systems Analysis, Conceptual Design Studies, Trade Studies, and Technology Assessments; highly pertinent experience for PWS area 4.2 Systems Safety Assurance and PWS area 4.3 Operational Integrity; somewhat pertinent experience in PWS area 4.1 Safety-Critical Aviation Systems Design Integrity; and did not address PWS area 5.2 Technical Interchange in Working Groups and Special Committees. After considering the similarity in the size, the content across all PWS areas, and the similarity in complexity to the FCSR acquisition and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Pertinence Rating of “Highly Pertinent” for the Saab team.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Saab and its significant subcontractors by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SET assigned an Overall Performance Rating of “Exceptional” for the Saab team.

Factor 2 - Price

The Cost/Price Analyst in consultation with the SET performed an analysis of the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness and cost realism, and confirm that the offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirement and possessed the ability to perform the contract for the stated cost. The Cost/Price Analyst then incorporated the results into a detailed report. Based on initial findings, the Cost/Price Analyst concluded that additional information was needed to

complete the cost analysis. After completion of discussions, and in accordance with FAR 15.402, the CO has determined that the offerors' proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the fact that adequate price competition was obtained, the spread from the highest proposed price to the lowest proposed price, and comparison of the proposed prices to the Government estimate.

Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization

Set forth below is a summary of the Small Business Utilization Findings for the offerors. As required by RFP M.4(c) the SET only evaluated the offerors commitment to the small business program for strengths and weaknesses.

Offeror	Small Business Subcontracting Plan	Commitment to Small Business
Boeing	Meets	Meets
Honeywell	Meets	Meets
Rockwell	Meets	Meets
Saab	Meets	Meets

Boeing:

The SET consensus was that Boeing met the requirements of the small business subcontracting plan identified in the RFP. The SET consensus was that Boeing met the requirement for its commitment to small business. The SET also assigned Boeing a strength for its demonstrated established procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and small business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures.

Honeywell:

The SET consensus was that Honeywell met the requirements of the small business subcontracting plan identified in the RFP. The SET consensus was that Honeywell met the requirement for its commitment to small business. The SET also assigned Honeywell a strength for its commitment to small business for its identification of small business significant subcontractors in specific targeted areas as well as the identification of additional small business subcontracting opportunities.

Rockwell:

The SET consensus was that Rockwell met the requirements of the small business subcontracting plan identified in the RFP. The SET consensus was that Rockwell met the requirement for its commitment to small business. The SET also assigned Saab a strength for its established procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and small business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures

Saab:

The SET consensus was that Saab met the requirements of the small business subcontracting plan identified in the RFP. The SET consensus was that Saab met the requirement for its commitment to small business.

Basis for Selection

The SET presented its findings to me on May 20, 2013 and I am convinced that the SET conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation criteria in the RFP. As documented earlier, the CO determined that the procedures at NFS 1815.305 (a) apply as the number of responsive proposals was no more than the number of awards contemplated. As required by NFS 1815.305-71(a), the CO reviewed the solicitation and the proposals and determined that (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive, and (2) adequate price competition exists based on the receipt of multiple responsive and competitive proposals.

NFS 1815.305-71(a) also requires that the CO determine if the proposal(s) is an acceptable proposal. The CO reviewed the SET findings and determined that each proposal was acceptable. I concur with the findings of the SET and CO. Specifically, in evaluating the four offerors for Factor 1 - Past Performance, each proposal was determined to be acceptable based on the offerors receiving a Very High Level of Confidence or High Level of Confidence rating, as a result of very highly pertinent and highly pertinent work experience, and exceptional performance. Regarding Factor 2 - Price, I noted that a detailed analysis of the proposed prices was performed and each proposal was determined to be reasonable and realistic and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that each offeror meets the requirements of small business subcontracting in accordance with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements, the subcontracting goals established for this procurement, and the commitment to small businesses.

Source Selection Decision

Based on the determinations above, NFS 1815.305-71(a) requires that the SSA direct the CO to:

- (1) Award without discussions provided the CO determines that adequate price competition exists;
- (2) Award after negotiating an acceptable contract; or
- (3) Reject the proposal and cancel the solicitation.

As stated above, I find that each offeror was determined acceptable under Factor 1 - Past Performance and Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization. In addition, for Factor 2 - Price, I find that each offeror's proposal is reasonable, realistic, reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements; and consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Offeror's proposal. Last, as noted during the briefing to me on May 20, 2013, the CO determined that all four proposals were acceptable after the successful conclusion of discussions on April 23, 2013.

Therefore, pursuant to NFS1815.305-71(a), I hereby direct the CO to award to Boeing, Honeywell, Rockwell, and Saab without further discussions, based on the findings documented.

Susan E. McClain
Susan E. McClain
Source Selection Authority

Date: *May 21, 2013*