

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001

Selection of Contractor
For
Rotary Wing Technology Development (RWTD)
NNA13464313R-ALR

November 17, 2014

On November 06, 2014, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) Ex-Officio members, met with the SEC members appointed to evaluate proposals for the Rotary Wing Technology Development procurement at NASA Ames Research Center (ARC). During this meeting, the SEC presented its final evaluation findings to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and we discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

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

Procurement Description

ARC currently has a RWTD requirement to support the research and development of rotary wing technology at ARC. This contract will provide new technologies for civilian helicopters and advanced vertical lift aircraft, advances in mobility and long-term sustainability through enabling efficient and safe rotary wing aircraft and operations, and support for other U.S. agencies to meet unique critical technology needs in rotorcraft development, including multi-service aircraft utilization.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition. It will result in multiple awards for Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF), Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contracts. The minimum value for each contract is \$25,000.00 and the maximum aggregate value for all contracts awarded as a result of this procurement is \$40,000,000.00. The period of performance for each contract is five-years with no option periods.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation, paragraph M.2, "Evaluation Approach," advised Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror was required to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a cost/price and technical standpoint. However, the

Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on the basis of initial offers was determined not to be in the best interest of the Government. A Competitive Range was, in fact, established and discussions were held with the Offerors in the Competitive Range.

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

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

MISSION SUITABILITY	
Sub-factors	Assigned Weight
Technical Capability to Meet Requirements, Staffing and Facilities	700
Management Plan	200
Organizational Structure	
Management Approach	
Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan	
Safety and Health Plan	
Small Business Utilization	100
Total Points	1000

Each Offeror's Mission Suitability proposal was evaluated based on its ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule and safety requirements. The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches, and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. The RFP stipulated that the overall Mission Suitability Factor would only receive a numerical score, and the Mission Suitability Sub-factors would be assigned adjectival ratings and numerical scores. In accordance with NFS Subpart 1815.305(a)(3), "Technical Evaluation," the following were the potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. In Section M, paragraph M.2, "Evaluation Approach," the RFP defined these adjectival ratings as well as provided applicable percentile ranges at each rating level.

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated that the evaluation would be an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The Past Performance evaluation was based on the information provided by the Offeror in its Past Performance Volume II and on the assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of each Offeror and of its major subcontractors, predecessor companies, and any organization that would substantially contribute to the proposed contract, or would have the potential to significantly impact performance of the proposed contract, as well as information from other sources described

in Section L, including the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). Further, for each Offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEC evaluated overall Past Performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirement of the current acquisition. The SEC evaluated the depth of the Offeror's relevant Past Performance and gave evaluative credit to the quality, as well as the quantity, of the Offeror's Past Performance. This Factor was designed to provide an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by the Offerors to the Government and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor. The RFP required evaluation of the Past Performance Factor using the following Level of Confidence ratings: Very High Level of Confidence; High Level of Confidence; Moderate Level of Confidence; Low Level of Confidence; Very Low Level of Confidence and Neutral/Unknown Level of Confidence. In Section M, paragraph M.2, "Evaluation Approach," the RFP defined these Level of Confidence ratings.

The SEC conducted its evaluation of the Cost Factor by performing a price analysis, a cost analysis, and a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.4. The SEC analyzed the proposed costs to determine the cost and associated risks of doing business with each Offeror. The overall CPFF for selection purposes was the sum of the CPFF of the three sample task orders. In accordance with FAR Subpart 15.404-1(d), the SEC performed a cost realism analysis on the proposed cost, which resulted in an assessment of probable cost.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

In an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and to improve communications amongst all parties, ARC issued a draft RFP that allowed for industry recommendations and comments on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach in satisfying the requirements. ARC also electronically issued Acquisition Updates containing pertinent RWTD information. ARC encouraged industry to ask questions about the RWTD requirements and the procurement process. The questions and comments received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated in the final RFP, as appropriate. A Government response to each question or comment was prepared and was made available electronically to the public.

All documents pertinent to the acquisition were posted electronically on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities web portal (<https://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgibin/eps/synopsis.cgi?acqid=157006>), as well as the Federal Business Opportunities web portal (<https://www.fbo.gov>).

The draft RFP was released on October 28, 2013. The final RFP was released on December 4, 2013. Amendment 1 was posted on December 18, 2013, and it contained questions and answers and minor changes to the final RFP. Amendment 2 was posted on January 10, 2014, and it contained questions and answers and minor changes to the final RFP. Amendment 3 was posted on January 14, 2014 and it contained questions and answers to the final RFP. With each Offeror's proposal submission, Offerors were to include a Standard Form 33 signed by an official authorized to contractually bind the Offeror and written acknowledgement of any solicitation amendments. Proposals in response to the final RFP were due on January 24, 2014.

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

Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.
600 E. Hurst Blvd.
Hurst, TX 76053

The Boeing Company
5000 East McDowell Road
Mesa, AZ 85215-9797

Georgia Tech Applied Research Corporation (GTARC)
505 Tenth Street NW
Atlanta, GA 30318

Monterey Technologies, Inc. (MTI)
24600 Silver cloud Ct., Suite 103
Monterey, CA 93940

Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation
6900 Main Street
Stratford, CT 06615-9129

Proposals, including a cover letter, were received from each Offeror. Each proposal consisted of three separate volumes, corresponding to the three respective evaluation Factors, in accordance with Section L of the solicitation and FAR Subparts 15.101 and 15.306. A copy of each proposal for the five Offerors was issued to each SEC member and the Contract Price/Cost Analyst (non-voting member) an Ex-Officio to the board.

Evaluation Process

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

For the Past Performance Factor, the SEC members evaluated and identified findings based on the Offerors' proposals, questionnaires received, and the information from the PPIRS database. NFS 1815.305(a)(2) gives discretion to the individual NASA Centers on whether to assign strengths or weaknesses in Past Performance. For purposes of this procurement, ARC decided not to assign strengths or weaknesses in the Past Performance Factor. The SEC's evaluation documented each Offeror's relevant Past Performance and

the currency of the Past Performance to assess and assign the Offeror's overall Level of Confidence rating. No adverse Past Performance information or weaknesses were identified for any of the Offerors.

The SEC, including the Contract Price/Cost Analyst, reviewed all of the Cost Proposals. The SEC performed a cost analysis, price analysis and cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.4 and NFS Subpart 1815.305(a)(1)(B). The Contract Price/Cost Analyst's analysis of cost realism for each proposal did not require probable cost adjustments for any of the Offerors. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Cost Factor.

The SEC briefed me on its initial findings on July 2, 2014. I recommended that we enter into discussions, and the Contracting Officer established a Competitive Range to include all five Offerors. On August 4, 2014, discussions were opened with the five Offerors. All weaknesses and deficiencies assigned in Mission Suitability were discussed, as were any questions that remained regarding Cost. The SEC did not have any questions relating to Past Performance. In turn, the Offerors submitted responses to these questions. The SEC reviewed and evaluated each Offeror's response. After several rounds of discussions with the Offerors, discussions were closed on October 02, 2014 and a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) was requested from each Offeror in the Competitive Range.

FPRs were received on October 08, 2014, and the SEC evaluated each Offeror's Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. The SEC met to discuss their final findings and reached a consensus.

All SEC members read and evaluated the FPRs and identified whether findings from the initial proposal (strengths and weaknesses) for each Factor and Sub-factor remained or changed based on the newly submitted information. Once all of the FPRs were evaluated, the SEC re-scored and re-assigned final adjectival ratings as necessary and appropriate. None of the FPRs contained any "Deficiencies," "Significant Weaknesses," or "Weaknesses" in Mission Suitability, nor any adverse Past Performance information, nor generated any further questions regarding Cost. Specifically regarding Cost, the SEC and the Contract Price/Cost Analyst evaluated the FPRs, and performed a cost analysis, price analysis, and cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.4. In accordance with the solicitation, the SEC determined that each Offeror's proposal adequately demonstrated its ability to perform the work with the proposed resources; therefore, there were no Mission Suitability findings resulting from the Cost Factor analyses for any of the Offerors.

I reviewed the SEC's findings for Mission Suitability and the resultant adjectival ratings and numerical scores. I reviewed the findings and Level of Confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the Cost evaluation results, including the proposed and probable costs. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

Evaluation Findings of the SEC

Mission Suitability Factor

Bell

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by BAH received 635 points (out of a possible 1000), resulting in a five-way tie.

In the Technical Capability Sub-factor, Bell received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 455 points (out of a possible 700). One (1) Strength and no Significant Strengths were identified.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, Bell received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 120 points (out of a possible 200). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Sub-factor, Bell received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 60 points (out of a possible 100). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

Boeing

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by Boeing received 635 points (out of a possible 1000), resulting in a five-way tie.

In the Technical Capability Sub-factor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 455 points (out of a possible 700). One (1) Strength and no Significant Strengths were identified.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 120 points (out of a possible 200). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Sub-factor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 60 points (out of a possible 100). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

GTARC

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by GTARC received 635 points (out of a possible 1000), resulting in a five-way tie.

In the Technical Capability Sub-factor, GTARC received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 455 points (out of a possible 700). One (1) Strength and no Significant Strengths were identified.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, GTARC received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 120 points (out of a possible 200). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Sub-factor, GTARC received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 60 points (out of a possible 100). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

MTI

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by MTI received 635 points (out of a possible 1000), resulting in a five-way tie.

In the Technical Capability Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 420 points (out of a possible 700). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 120 points (out of a possible 200). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Sub-factor, MTI received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 95 points (out of a possible 100). One (1) Significant Strength and no Strengths were identified.

Sikorsky

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by Sikorsky received 635 points (out of a possible 1000), resulting in a five-way tie.

In the Technical Capability Sub-factor, Sikorsky received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 455 points (out of a possible 700). One (1) Strength and no Significant Strengths were identified.

In the Management Plan Sub-factor, Sikorsky received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 120 points (out of a possible 200). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

In the Small Business Utilization Sub-factor, Sikorsky received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 60 points (out of a possible 100). No Significant Strengths and no Strengths were identified.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance evaluation for each of the five Offerors.

Bell

The evaluation of Bell's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror demonstrated very effective past performance on performing services and delivering products that are highly pertinent to the requirements of this solicitation.

Boeing

The evaluation of Boeing's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror demonstrated very effective past performance on performing services and delivering products that are highly pertinent to the requirements of this solicitation.

GTARC

The evaluation of GTARC's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror demonstrated very effective past performance on performing services and delivering products that are highly pertinent to the requirements of this solicitation.

MTI

The evaluation of MTI's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror demonstrated very effective past performance on performing services and delivering products that are highly pertinent to the requirements of this solicitation.

Sikorsky

The evaluation of Sikorsky's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror demonstrated very effective past performance on performing services and delivering products that are highly pertinent to the requirements of this solicitation.

Cost Factor

The SEC, with the assistance of the Contract Price/Cost Analyst, evaluated each Offeror's Cost proposal for realism and to ensure the cost reflected a sound approach to satisfying the requirements. Each Offeror's unique technical approach to the three Sample Tasks Orders directly impacted the overall proposed Cost of each Offeror. None of the Offerors' Cost proposals required a probable cost adjustment; therefore, the total proposed Cost was the same as the Probable Cost for each of the three Sample Task Orders.

Bell had the third highest total Proposed/Probable Cost.

Boeing had the highest total Proposed/Probable Cost.

GTARC had the second lowest Proposed/Probable Cost.

MTI had the lowest total Proposed/Probable Cost.

Sikorsky had the second highest total Proposed/Probable cost.

Selection Decision of the Source Selection Authority for RWTD

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

My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEC's findings to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply rely on the Mission Suitability scores or the number of strengths; rather, I primarily considered the potential impact of each finding and its relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP. I carefully reviewed all of the findings of the SEC, and I concur with, and adopt, all of them without exception. I am fully satisfied that the SEC conducted a thorough and well-reasoned analysis of each of the proposals submitted and that its findings are appropriate and reasonable.

Selection

To reiterate, Mission Suitability is moderately more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is moderately more important than Cost. Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Cost.

Each Offeror received one Strength or Significant Strength, and no weaknesses or deficiencies, in the Mission Suitability Factor. All demonstrated sound technical understanding of the requirements, and received the same overall Mission Suitability score. Further, each Offeror demonstrated its ability to perform similar complex requirements and received a High Level of Confidence in the Past Performance Factor. Finally, although the Offerors had different Proposed and Probable Costs, this is the direct result of the different technical approaches each Offeror proposed for the three sample tasks. Each of these different technical approaches were effective and met the requirements of the SOW and the three sample tasks. There were no adjustments to any of the Offerors' costs because there were no weaknesses identified in any of the sample tasks. All of the Costs for each of the five Offerors were deemed fair and reasonable.

In my opinion, having access to different approaches to address technical requirements with varying levels of complexity will greatly benefit the Government. In conclusion, based on all of the Offerors' abilities to effectively meet the technical requirements, their High Level of Confidence ratings in Past Performance, and their fair and reasonable Costs, it is in

the best interest of the Government that I select all five Offerors—Bell, Boeing, GTARC, MTI and Sikorsky—for contract award.

Thomas A Edwards

Dr. Thomas A. Edwards
Source Selection Authority
Director of Aeronautics
NASA Ames Research Center