

**Selection Statement
For
Electrical Systems Engineering Services II (ESES II)
Request for Proposal (RFP) RFP NNG11375927R**

On April 2, 2013, I, along with key senior officials from NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Electrical Systems Engineering Services II (ESES II) procurement. A full briefing of the results of the evaluation conducted by the SEB was presented to me, resulting in my source selection decision.

Procurement Description and History

The ESES II requirement was issued as a small business set-aside, competitive procurement under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 541712, with a small business size standard of 1000 employees. The ESES II contract will be awarded as a Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF), Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with a five year ordering period. There is also a 30-day phase-in period, which will commence upon contract award, to be implemented as Task One.

The scope of work under the ESES II procurement is to provide electrical systems engineering support services and related work to the Applied Engineering and Technology Directorate's (AETD) Electrical Engineering Division, Instrument Systems and Technology Division, Software Engineering Division, Mechanical Systems Division, Mission Engineering and Systems Analysis Division, and related organizations, as required, for both in-house and out-of-house instrument and spacecraft programs, for the study, design, systems engineering, development, fabrication, integration, testing, verification, and operations of space flight, airborne, and ground system hardware and software, including development and validation of new technologies to enable future space and science missions.

NASA issued the ESES II RFP on January 13, 2012. A team of technical and business members and consultants from appropriate disciplines were appointed to assist in proposal evaluation. The following Amendments were issued to the RFP:

Amendment 1	February 6, 2012
Amendment 2	February 7, 2012
Amendment 3	September 19, 2012
Amendment 4	September 26, 2012
Amendment 5	February 19, 2013
Amendment 6	February 24, 2013

The following seven companies submitted initial proposals by the RFP due date of February 13, 2012.

ASRC Management Services (AMS)
ADNET Systems Inc.
ERC Inc. (ERC)
Jackson and Tull (J&T)
MEI Technologies (MEIT)
Science Systems Application, Inc. (SSAI)
Vantage Systems Technologies (VST)

The SEB presented its initial findings to me on August 9, 2012. At this meeting, the Contracting Officer determined that a competitive range would be established and discussions would be held with the Offerors in the competitive range. The two lowest rated Offerors were eliminated from competition in accordance with FAR Parts 15.306(c)(1) and 15.306(c)(3). With my concurrence, the Contracting Officer included the following five Offerors in the competitive range: AMS, J&T, MEIT, SSAI and VST. The Agency held discussions with the five Offerors and requested Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) on September 19, 2012, by issuing Amendment 3 to the RFP. Five FPRs were received by the due date of October 5, 2012.

On January 14, 2013, the SEB presented its findings to me on its evaluation of the FPRs of the five Offerors in the original competitive range. Since evaluation issues still remained, the Contracting Officer and I determined additional discussions were appropriate, and the two lowest rated Offerors were eliminated from the competitive range. With my concurrence, the Contracting Officer included the following three most highly competitive Offerors in the competitive range: AMS, J&T, and SSAI. The Agency held additional discussions with the three Offerors, and requested Revised Final Proposal Revisions (RFPRs) on February 19, 2013, by issuing Amendment 5 to the RFP. Three RFPRs were received by the due date of February 26, 2013.

Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection," and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, "Source Selection," and the ESES II RFP evaluation criteria. The RFP provided that the factors used for evaluation of the proposals are Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Section M.2 of the RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors:

"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 Mission Suitability factor and the Cost factor are approximately equal and the Past Performance factor is less important."

The RFP contained a detailed explanation of the evaluation procedures, including the evaluation Factors and Subfactors, the Mission Suitability numerical scoring scheme delineated below, and the criteria to be used in the evaluation.

The RFP stated that only the Mission Suitability Factor would be point scored in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability Factor consisted of the following two Subfactors with assigned points as indicated:

Subfactor	Points
Subfactor A – Representative Task Orders	500
Subfactor B – Management Approach	500
Total	1000

The SEB conducted an independent Mission Suitability evaluation of each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation. The proposals were evaluated by classifying the proposal findings in each subfactor as “Strengths,” “Weaknesses,” “Significant Strengths,” “Significant Weaknesses,” or “Deficiencies” per the definitions in the RFP, Section M.4. The Mission Suitability Subfactors were then evaluated using the adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The applicable adjectival ratings for each Mission Suitability Subfactor were “Excellent,” “Very Good,” “Good,” “Fair,” and “Poor.” The maximum points available for each subfactor were multiplied by the assessed percent rating for each subfactor to derive the score for that respective subfactor. The individual scores in each subfactor were then summed to determine the overall Mission Suitability scoring. The adjectival ratings of the findings and the adjectival ratings and assessed percent ratings of the subfactors were determined by consensus of the SEB voting members. Per the RFP, the Mission Suitability evaluation included the results of any cost realism analysis.

The RFP stated that the cost evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). The RFP referred Offerors 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.”

The proposed cost (proposed Government Pricing Model), proposed direct and indirect rates, Representative Task Order 3, along with the proposed phase-in cost were analyzed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The proposed and probable costs were presented to me along with any cost risks identified in the SEB’s analysis of Offerors’ proposals.

For the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated the evaluation of past performance would be conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15. The evaluation of past performance involved the degree of relevance (i.e., level of pertinence) of the contract based on size, content, and/or complexity, and the quality of performance on the contract. First, the SEB examined the Offerors’ contract references (including those of significant subcontractors) to determine whether each contract met the minimum requirements to warrant consideration. If the contract was deemed “recent” and met the minimum cost/fee (relevant size) criteria, the SEB evaluated the degree of relevance and quality of contract performance of each referenced contract. Finally, the

SEB assigned an overall Level of Confidence rating to the Offeror based on a subjective evaluation of the information provided for all of the referenced contracts.

Consistent with the RFP, the past performance of significant subcontractors was evaluated and attributed to the Offeror and weighted according to the work proposed to be performed on the ESES II Contract. Performance of the Prime Offeror was weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors.

The Past Performance Factor was not point scored, but was assigned one of the following adjectival ratings:

Very High Level of Confidence
High Level of Confidence
Moderate Level of Confidence
Low Level of Confidence
Very Low Level of Confidence
Neutral

Mission Suitability Evaluation Factor

The table below provides the adjectival ratings assigned in each Mission Suitability Subfactor.

Mission Suitability Subfactor Adjectival Ratings	AMS	J&T	SSAI
Subfactor A: Representatives Task Orders	VERY GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
Subfactor B: Management Approach	GOOD	VERY GOOD	GOOD

Numerical scoring was also assigned, consistent with the adjectival ratings, as prescribed in the RFP. The difference between the highest and lowest Mission Suitability numerical score was less than 5 percent. The details of the SEB's evaluation of Mission Suitability for each Offeror's RFPR are presented below.

AMS:

For **Subfactor A, Representative Task Orders**, the AMS proposal received one (1) significant strength, nine (9) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor A rating of "Very Good."

Significant Strength #1: The AMS proposal received a significant strength for demonstrating an in-depth understanding of and expertise in High Voltage Power Supplies (HVPS), proposing an excellent technical approach that will result in a successful delivery of the instrument and mission success.

Strength #1: The AMS proposal received a strength for its risk assessment and validation effort, for RTO#1. AMS looked at the entire detector system, end to end, from Charge-Couple Detector (CCD) to front-end processing during its evaluation and Prototype Performance Demo, resulting in a comprehensive understanding that will result in completing the testing on time with minimal impacts. *Strength #2:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its good system engineering and risk management approach for RTO#2, that identifies risks, as the design matures, and their associated impacts on each subsystem's requirement. This approach would mitigate the impact to cost and schedule resulting from changes in the baseline design. *Strength #3:* The AMS proposal received a strength for RTO#2 by performing a mission safety compliance analysis between the Instrument and Spacecraft (S/C), reducing the potential risk of an Instrument fault that would upset the S/C and result in mission failure. *Strength #4:* The AMS proposal received a strength for demonstrating a strong approach to design trades on the electronics in RTO#3, with two viable approaches on the Data/Command Interface (DI) and the use of the failure report of the HVPS. This approach indicates a comprehensive understanding of task complexities and staffing resources, resulting in potential cost and schedule savings. *Strength #5:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its complete description of solar cycle effects in RTO#2, leading to minimizing cost and schedule associated with the purchase of radiation hardened Electrical, Electronic, & Electro-Mechanical (EEE) parts. *Strength #6:* The AMS proposal received a strength for demonstrating a thorough understanding of thermal effects of the Focal Plane Assembly (FPA) in RTO#1 by identifying risks and trades associated with the thermal control systems, resulting in reduction of risk and schedule impacts. *Strength #7:* The AMS proposal received a strength for doing a thorough job of assessing the impact to the flight software in RTO#1 if the processor has to be replaced. Awareness of the impacts to the flight software of a processor switch will reduce the chances that flight software issues will negatively impact budget and schedule. *Strength #8:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its approach to evaluating the Radio Frequency (RF) communication subsystem requirement changes in RTO#2, which demonstrated a detailed understanding of RF communication systems that will result in cost and schedule savings. *Strength #9:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its tailored plan for re-integration and testing at the GHI instrument level in RTO#3 to reduce unnecessary tests and potential damage due to over-testing.

For **Subfactor B, Management Approach**, the AMS proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, nine (9) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor B rating of "Good."

Strength #1: The AMS proposal received a strength for its demonstrated capabilities to fabricate Printed Circuit Boards (PCB) that will result in efficiently meeting NASA's requirements and in reducing the risk of cost and schedule slips. *Strength #2:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its attention to and concern for manufacturing related issues, resulting in reliable resource availability to meet time-critical schedules. *Strength #3:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its wide-range of software design and analytical tools that will assist its ability to perform a variety of SOW tasks, reducing the risk to task performance and schedule. *Strength #4:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its extensive parts database and counterfeit parts program that will result in the procurement of quality parts, reducing the risk of impacting cost and schedule of returning parts or looking for alternatives. *Strength #5:* The AMS proposal received

a strength for its proposed communication and task management/coordination approach, resulting in a more responsive level of effort by its organization. *Strength #6:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its task order (TO) management and tracking system that will enhance NASA oversight, resulting in reducing risk in TO management accountability. *Strength #7:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its proposed approach to communicating issues within its organization to reduce the risk of unresolved quality issues. *Strength #8:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its proposed process for organizational planning to identify, mitigate, and resolve issues in order to minimize the workload impact across all TO's, resulting in properly mitigating those risks that could materially impact contract performance over the life of the contract. *Strength #9:* The AMS proposal received a strength for its proposed approach to promoting safety and health within its company. AMS's proactive approach will ensure its operations safeguard the health of its employees, NASA personnel, and prevent damage to facilities/equipment.

J&T:

For **Subfactor A, Representative Task Orders**, the J&T proposal received one (1) significant strength, two (2) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor A rating of "Very Good."

Significant Strength: The J&T proposal received a significant strength for its approach to RTO#2. The proposed approach demonstrated an excellent understanding of system engineering practices and provided a comprehensive technical approach and task plan to ensure successful completion of this task.

Strength #1: The J&T proposal received a strength for its well written task plan and technical approach in RTO#1 for conducting the Trade Evaluation and Analysis Studies, which will result in cost savings and minimizing schedule slips. *Strength #2:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its detailed task plan for RTO#3, which demonstrated an understanding of the task by utilizing sound systems engineering approaches, resulting in completing the Task on schedule and within budget.

For **Subfactor B, Management Approach**, the J&T proposal received one (1) significant strength, eight (8) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor B rating of "Very Good."

Significant Strength: The J&T proposal received a significant strength for proposing its own in-house manufacturing capability, including a manufacturing facility and equipment and software design tools that are well suited for this effort. This manufacturing facility can perform both electrical and mechanical fabrication, including conformal coating and harness fabrication. This resource, along with its subcontractors' facilities, will provide the Government with substantial dedicated facilities and equipment to meet fabrication tasks requirements, reducing risk to schedule and technical performance.

Strength #1: The J&T proposal received a strength for its demonstrated capabilities to fabricate and assemble PC boards that will result in efficiently meeting task requirements, reducing the

risk of cost and schedule slips. *Strength #2:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its proposed staffing, which includes a full-time manufacturing manager, allowing manufacturing resources to be managed at the organizational level rather than the individual task level, resulting in appropriate resource availability to meet schedules. *Strength #3:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its proposed usage of a wide-range of software design and analytical tools that will assist in its ability to perform a variety of SOW tasks, reducing risk to task performance and schedule. *Strength #4:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its detailed and comprehensive discussion of its task order development and management processes, demonstrating its ability to effectively respond to task order proposal requests and manage the resulting task orders, thus increasing the likelihood that tasks will be initiated when needed and appropriately managed to ensure timely submission of deliverables within the estimated cost. *Strength #5:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its organization, incorporating full-time Group Managers (GM) that reflect the GSFC engineering organizational structure to increase communication and task management/coordination, thus reducing the possibility of cost overruns and/or schedule delays. *Strength #6:* The J&T proposal received a strength for its Management System, which is currently third-party certified to AS9100, exceeding the RFP requirement and satisfying NASA NPD 8730.5B requirements for the performance of work that is both critical and complex. This indicates a high-level of commitment by management to quality, thus reducing the risk of quality issues not being addressed properly. *Strength #7:* The J&T proposal received a strength for proposing a Safety and Mission Assurance (SHMA) Manager who reports directly to the Director of Corporate Safety, Health and Mission Assurance, who in turn reports to the Chief Operating Officer of J&T, resulting in an independent means of communication and visibility on SHMA issues, thus reducing the risk of unresolved quality issues. *Strength #8:* The J&T proposal received a strength for demonstrating a clear and forward thinking process within its organizational planning to identify, mitigate, and quickly resolve issues that develop that will minimize the impact to workload across all TOs.

SSAI:

For **Subfactor A, Representative Task Orders**, the SSAI proposal received four (4) significant strengths, nine (9) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor A rating of “Excellent.”

Significant Strength #1: The SSAI proposal received a significant strength for its extremely well organized and insightful systems engineering approach for RTO#1, which will result in successful completion of this task on schedule and meeting all performance requirements. Their “within/across” systems analysis approach was thorough and provided insightful risk assessment and mitigation strategy. The risk assessment addressed all meaningful areas of concern with excellent mitigations. Most notable were the comparisons to similar experiences/programs that gave the reader assurances of their technical expertise in carrying out this kind of technical work.

Significant Strength #2: The SSAI proposal received a significant strength for its detailed spacecraft systems impact assessment and trade analyses for RTO#2. The proposed approach is comprehensive and will result in the successful completion of this task on schedule and in meeting all performance requirements. SSAI demonstrated an excellent understanding of system and subsystem interfaces that may be impacted by the change in requirements posed by the RTO,

as noted in its “change influence” diagram, an excellent method of mapping out the impacts of the changes to the system interfaces. The systems trades were expertly devised and demonstrated sound understanding of the interactions between subsystems and mission level requirements. Throughout its technical approach, SSAI clearly listed the outputs of its approach, implementation methodology, and corresponding technical risks.

Significant Strength #3: The SSAI proposal received a significant strength for its comprehensive assessment of the impacts to the Guidance, Navigation, and Control (GN&C) and solutions that would result in a very thorough Impact Analyses/Trade Report. As part of its proposed changes and evaluation of the longer life of the mission, the GN&C system is fully assessed to address the vibration issues that would either affect the updated communication system or in turn the performance of the Instrument for jitter. SSAI also addressed the reliability and performance aspect of the increased life, from looking at the part in the off-the-shelf components, and increasing the number of units for selective redundancy where reliability predictions suggest weaknesses, to increasing the volume of propulsion for the longer mission.

Significant Strength #4: The SSAI proposal received a significant strength for demonstrating an excellent understanding of objectives of the task for RTO#3 for developing a very sound technical approach and solution set. SSAI performed an excellent requirements analysis and accommodations assessment, addressing the impacts of all interdependencies on each of the affected subsystems, and provided logical technical substantiations and assumptions. The very thorough task plan, trades studies, and accommodations assessment will result in successful completion of this task on schedule and meeting all performance requirements.

Strength #1: The SSAI proposal received a strength for proposing a thorough and systematic approach for performing the technical risk analysis for RTO#1 that will result in mitigating cost and schedule impacts. *Strength #2:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its in-depth understanding of Electrical, Electronic, & Electro-Mechanical (EEE) parts & radiation engineering for RTO#1 by developing a radiation hardness assurance program (RHAP) and Electronic Parts Control Program (PCP) leading up to the preliminary design review (PDR) of the Visible Light Telescope (VLT), which decreases EEE parts and system reliability risk to the instrument. *Strength #3:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for RTO#1 by demonstrating a thorough understanding of thermal effects by identifying risks and trades associated with the thermal control systems, resulting in reduction of risk and schedule impacts. *Strength #4:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its proposed approach to using tested flight designs for risk mitigation for RTO#1, which will result in schedule and cost savings. The SSAI's proposal to examine alternative approaches to risk mitigation will keep the project on schedule and result in lower costs. *Strength #5:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its proposed use of the instrument data noise budget as a critical system development and analysis tool for RTO#1 to quantify system and subsystem contributions to overall instrument performance, which will result in a thorough risk mitigation plan and timely delivery of the instrument. *Strength #6:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its inclusion of specific radiation engineering support and the way in which it addressed the broad scope of radiation impact on QRS systems for RTO#2, suggesting a coherent technical approach that would positively impact post-preliminary design risk (PDR) mitigation. *Strength #7:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its proposed approach to evaluating the Radio Frequency (RF) communication subsystem requirement

changes in RTO#2 thus demonstrating a detailed understanding of RF communication systems which will result in cost and schedule savings. *Strength #8:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for demonstrating a clear and full understanding required to qualify electronic components in RTO#3 and for presenting a complete picture of Radiation Hardness Assurance Program (RHAP) and its vital interconnections that will result in mitigation of cost and schedule impacts of the procurement of flight Electrical, Electronic, & Electro-Mechanical (EEE) parts. *Strength #9:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its proposed approach to the replacement of the High Voltage Power Supply (HVPS) in RTO#3, which shows a thorough understanding of the issues and complexities of high voltage power system design/fabrication.

For **Subfactor B, Management Approach**, the SSAI proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, eight (8) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies for a Subfactor A rating of “Good.”

Strength #1: The SSAI proposal received a strength for its Electronics Design and Analysis Lab EDAL, an offsite facility that will be funded using corporate funding. Such a facility will provide compatible electrical engineering design capability augmenting GSFC design labs, resulting in improved efficiency and potential cost savings. *Strength #2:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for proposing to provide a suite of software design and analytical tools that will assist its ability to perform the majority of SOW tasks, resulting in reducing risk to Task performance and schedule. *Strength #3:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for proposing a Chief Scientist, at no direct cost to the Government (covered in overhead), to improve the coordination of science/engineering requirements amongst Project scientists, Mission Instrument teams and SSAI and its teammates, enhancing the likelihood of meeting science goals within cost and schedule allocations. *Strength #4:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its Task Management System (TMS), which promotes transparency and efficiency, resulting in enhanced contract management and potential cost savings. *Strength #5:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its Program Organization Plan, which increases communication and task management and coordination, resulting in more effective communication and oversight of the tasks by Task Monitors and reducing the risk of cost and/or schedule overruns. *Strength #6:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its current ISO-9001 certification and plans to be AS9100 certified within 12 months of contract award, resulting in a high degree of commitment to providing quality services and products. *Strength #7:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for its proposed ESES-II Safety & Mission Assurance Officer (SMAO) who reports directly to its Corporate Quality Officer, resulting in an independent means of communication and visibility on SMA issues. *Strength #8:* The SSAI proposal received a strength for proposing to provide a dedicated Senior Manufacturing Manager to manage all manufacturing efforts, reducing the risk to the Government by planning and tracking manufacturing efforts to ensure timely product delivery.

Cost Evaluation Factor

A cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B), the RFP, the definition of “cost realism” at FAR 2.101(b), and the discussion of “cost realism analysis and “probable cost” at FAR 15.404-1(d). The SEB provided me with their detailed cost analysis during their presentation.

In conducting its assessment, the SEB evaluated the cost elements proposed by each Offeror and its significant subcontractor (as defined in the RFP) to determine if the costs were realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the requirements, and were consistent with the unique methods of performance (technical and management approach and utilization of proposed personnel) described in the technical proposal. Direct and indirect rates were verified by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), as applicable. If information was not available from DCAA, NASA performed its own evaluation by examining supporting data provided by the Offeror. The SEB also verified that the proposed indirect rates were correctly applied to costs.

Both J&T's and SSAI's RFPR cost proposals were accepted as proposed with no adjustments for probable cost. AMS' cost proposal retained one minor cost issue associated with subcontracting costs, which resulted in a minimal upward probable cost adjustment (less than .5%) to AMS' proposed cost. AMS was evaluated as having the lowest proposed and probable cost, followed by J&T and SSAI, respectively. For both the proposed and probable costs, there was a range of less than 10 percent between the lowest and highest Offeror's proposed and probable costs.

Past Performance Evaluation Factor

The past performance evaluation was performed in accordance with FAR Part 15 and the RFP. The SEB assigned an overall Level of Confidence rating to the Offerors, as defined in the RFP, and based on a subjective evaluation of the information provided.

AMS

The SEB determined that the team's past performance had very high overall relevance after considering the size, content and complexity for all team member's evaluated contracts. Considering all performance data, the SEB determined that AMS' team had a very high overall performance rating. The SEB determined that AMS' past performance provided the Government with an overall **Very High Level of Confidence** in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP.

J&T

The SEB determined that the team's past performance had high overall relevance after considering the size, content and complexity for all team member's evaluated contracts. Considering all performance data, the SEB determined that J&T's team had a very high overall performance rating. The SEB determined that J&T's past performance provided the Government with an overall **High Level of Confidence** in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP.

SSAI

The SEB determined that the team's past performance had very high overall relevance after considering the size, content and complexity for all team member's evaluated contracts. Considering all performance data, the SEB determined that SSAI's team had a very high overall performance rating. The SEB determined that SSAI's past performance provided the

Government with an overall **Very High Level of Confidence** in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP.

Source Selection Decision

I have carefully reviewed the SEB's detailed written evaluation results for Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The SEB's presentation on April 2, 2013 provided additional insight and explanation of the SEB's findings. I solicited and considered the views of all of the attendees at the presentation, including the SEB members and other key senior officials at GSFC. These key senior officials have responsibility related to this acquisition and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

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 Mission Suitability factor and the Cost factor are approximately equal and the Past Performance factor is less important.

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the RFP source selection Evaluation Factors.

All three offerors provided high quality proposals with Mission Suitability point scores that had minor variances overall between the offerors. All offerors had numerous strengths in both Mission Suitability subfactors and no weaknesses after discussions and the final evaluation. I recognized that all significant strengths, strengths and weaknesses are not equal in terms of their value to the Government, and I closely reviewed all of the Mission Suitability findings to determine if there were meaningful discriminators between the offerors that would impact my selection decision.

Based on the assigned weightings in the RFP, Mission Suitability Subfactors A (Representative Task Orders, 500 points) and B (Management Plan, 500 points) were equal in weighting.

In Subfactor A, SSAI's proposal was rated highest with an Excellent adjectival rating. They provided the most comprehensive response to RTOs that resulted in more Significant Strengths than J&T and AMS. In reviewing the SEB's findings for SSAI, some of the most significant benefits I found were a thorough understanding and detailed response to the RTOs, a high quality systems engineering and technical approach, and a comprehensive approach to addressing the RTO requirements, risk identification, and risk mitigation.

While the SEB rated AMS and J&T one adjectival rating lower than SSAI for subfactor A, both of these offerors performed well in this area with Very Good adjectival ratings, based on a combination of Significant Strength(s), Strengths, and no Weaknesses. AMS demonstrated many of the same benefits as SSAI based on their understanding of requirements, good systems engineering and technical approach, and risk identification and management. J&T also received

similar findings based on their understanding of requirements, including an excellent systems engineering approach, a comprehensive technical approach, and well-organized risk assessment and mitigations, but J&T received notably fewer Strengths than either AMS or SSAI.

Overall, upon examining the findings and discussing the results with the SEB, while all three offerors had some similar benefits in Subfactor A, I determined that SSAI's Excellent rating and higher score in this subfactor was based on more Significant Strengths and Strengths, which represented a comprehensive and detailed response across all of the RTOs and their associated requirements. In contrast, J&T's proposal resulted in findings that were less comprehensive and more isolated to individual RTOs. AMS offered benefits that covered the RTOs more broadly than J&T, but yet not as comprehensively as SSAI.

In Subfactor B, J&T was rated highest with a Very Good adjectival rating, since they received the only Significant Strength finding among all offerors in this Subfactor. J&T's Significant Strength finding was associated with their in-house manufacturing capabilities and the dedication of a significant portion of those capabilities to this contract, combined with the resources of their subcontractors. In discussing this finding with the SEB and senior officials that attended the SEB's presentation, I determined that this did constitute an advantage for J&T, but not a significant advantage when compared to the proposal evaluations for SSAI and AMS, which both received a Good adjectival rating. All three offerors had several Strengths related to their Management Plan, and SSAI and AMS also offered highly capable manufacturing facilities, relying on their subcontractors for these facilities in comparison to J&T. Therefore, I determined that J&T's ability to accomplish this as a prime offeror does not represent a significant advantage over the subcontracting of manufacturing proposed by SSAI and AMS.

Accepting the findings and scoring that were presented by the SEB, and observing that some differences exist among the Mission Suitability proposals of the three offerors, I found that all three proposals provide numerous positive findings and no Weaknesses. I found AMS and J&T to be relatively equal in value within the Mission Suitability Factor, with AMS offering a more comprehensive approach to the RTOs and J&T having an advantageous Management Plan based on their in-house manufacturing capabilities. Based on their comprehensive approach to the RTOs Subfactor, SSAI had more significant findings and a slight advantage over both AMS and J&T in the Mission Suitability Factor.

The Cost Factor resulted in clear differentiation between the offerors, with a proposed and probable cost difference of almost ten percent between the lowest cost proposal from AMS and the highest cost proposal from SSAI. All three offerors did a commendable job of estimating their costs as both SSAI and J&T received no probable cost adjustments and AMS only received one very minor probable cost increase associated with subcontracting costs. Overall, I accept the SEB's probable cost recommendations as the basis for the cost comparison for all offerors. While the SEB noted some cost risk associated with J&T's proposal, based on the significant amount of cost estimating required to factor in the large proportional impact the ESES II contract would have on their overall business base, and consequently with the forecasting of indirect rates over the period of the contract, the SEB ultimately accepted J&T's proposal with no cost adjustments. While noting that some additional risk and/or uncertainty may be present in the J&T cost proposal, any such potential cost risk associated with that proposal did not factor into

my selection decision. The proposed and probable costs of AMS were slightly lower than J&T and moderately lower than SSAI. The lower proposed and probable costs of AMS and J&T resulted in an advantage compared to SSAI, and the lowest cost from AMS resulted in a slight advantage over J&T.

For the Past Performance Factor, both SSAI and AMS received Very High level of confidence ratings from the SEB, based on the combination of very high relevance and performance overall. J&T received a High level of confidence rating. While J&T also demonstrated Very High performance on past contract references, they did not demonstrate Very High overall relevance, since they did not have any prime contract references that were similar in size when compared to the ESES II requirements. While the RFP indicated that "content and/or complexity are more important than size in the evaluation of relevance," size was nevertheless a consideration in the evaluation. Overall, while Past Performance was weighted less heavily than Mission Suitability and Cost in the evaluation, the Very High past performance ratings from SSAI and AMS offer an advantage over J&T, given the fact that J&T did not demonstrate similar size relevance.

In summary, I have concluded that while there were differences in the Mission Suitability ratings and findings among the offerors, these differences did not result in any significant advantages in one offeror over another. SSAI's superior response to the RTOs Subfactor gives them a slight advantage overall in the Mission Suitability Factor. Cost, an equally important Factor, resulted in more notable differences among the offerors. Both AMS and J&T offered lower proposed and probable costs in comparison to SSAI, with AMS being the lowest overall. Given the minimal probable cost adjustments for all offerors and the SEB's thorough analysis of the cost proposals, I have confidence in the cost evaluation results, and they represent a meaningful discriminator in my selection decision. AMS and SSAI were rated higher than J&T in Past Performance, since they demonstrated Very High performance and relevance overall.

I have thus concluded that the Very High Past Performance from AMS, coupled with their lowest proposed and probable costs, and strong technical performance and sound management approach, offered the most significant advantages within the overall evaluation. While SSAI had a more comprehensive proposal in addressing the RTO portion of Mission Suitability, I find that the approximately ten percent lower proposed and probable cost of AMS is more advantageous, given the equal weighting of the Mission Suitability and Cost Factors. While J&T offered a slight advantage with their in-house manufacturing capabilities in the Management Plan subfactor within Mission Suitability, AMS had a more comprehensive response to the RTO subfactor, along with slightly lower costs and higher rated Past Performance.

Accordingly, based on my analysis of the SEB evaluation results and the RFP evaluation criteria, I have determined that AMS's proposal offers the best value to the Government and I have selected AMS for contract award.

Colleen N. Hartman

Dr. Colleen N. Hartman
Source Selection Authority

4/25/13

Date