

**Source Selection Statement  
Basic and Applied Aerospace Research Technology (BAART)  
Request for Proposal (RFP) NNL14ZB1001R**

On September 9, 2015, the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) for the Basic and Applied Research Technology (BAART) procurement presented its final evaluation findings to me in a formal source selection briefing.

**PROCUREMENT BACKGROUND**

The BAART contract will provide research and technology development for aerospace systems that supports the goals of NASA (hereinafter referred to as Agency) as well as reflects NASA Langley Research Center's strategic framework for research and development. Langley's strategic framework is based on product lines: Advanced Materials and Structural Systems; Aerosciences; Systems Analysis and Concepts; Entry, Descent, and Landing; Measurement Systems; Intelligent Flight Systems; and Atmospheric Characterization. The research scope ranges in maturity from basic research through tool and technology development through integrated technology demonstrations, potentially to include flight demonstrations, and vehicle concepts and performance conditions across the speed regimes from subsonic through hypersonic atmospheric flight. The scope of BAART includes: the current multiple award Structures, Materials, Aerodynamics, Aerothermodynamics and Acoustics Research and Technology (SMAAART) contracts issued to Analytical Services & Materials Inc. (NNL10AA03B), Alliant Techsystems Inc. (NNL10AA04B), The Boeing Company (NNL10AA05B), Lockheed Martin Corporation (NNL10AA06B), and Northrop Grumman Systems (NNL10AA07B); the current multiple award Flight Critical Systems Research (FCSR) contracts issued to The Boeing Company (NNL13AA03B), Honeywell International Inc. (NNL13AA04B), Rockwell Collins, Inc. (NNL13AA05B) and Saab Sensis Corporation (NNL13AA06B); and includes portions of scope of the current multiple award Inflatable Aerodynamic Decelerator (IAD) contracts issued to Airborne Systems North America of CA Inc. (NNL12AA02B), ILC Dover LLC. (NNL12AA03B), and Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company (NNL12AA04B); and the current single award contract Systems Analysis & Concept Development (SACD) issued to Spaceworks Enterprises, Inc. (NNL11AA05B).

In order to maximize value to the Government and to also maximize opportunities for Industry, the Performance Work Statement (PWS) of BAART was divided into five technical tracks that mirror Langley's product lines. These technical tracks are:

Track A	Advanced Materials and Structural Systems, Aerodynamics, Aerothermodynamics, and Acoustics.
Track B	Systems Analysis and Concepts
Track C	Entry Descent and Landing
Track D	Measurement Systems and Autonomous Technologies
Track E	Flight-Critical and Intelligent Flight Systems

The BAART Request for Proposal (RFP) specified that the selection will result in awards to the Offerors whose proposals represent the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Past Performance, Cost/Price, Small Business Utilization (SBU), and Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) evaluation factors. The resultant contracts will be Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) with the ability to issue task orders against the corresponding contract line item number (CLIN): on a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CLIN 001), Firm-Fixed-Price (CLIN 002), or Cost Share basis (CLIN 003). The contract also includes CLIN 004 to allow for the obligation of funds to cover the minimum contract value of \$10,000 per each individual contract. The period of performance of the BAART contract will be five years from the effective date of award. The total cost estimate for the 5-year period of performance is \$402M for all technical tracks awarded.

Market research was conducted that included a Sources Sought Notice posted on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and the Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) website on April 16, 2014 with a response date of May 5, 2014. There were twelve respondents to the Sources Sought Notice; three were large businesses and nine were small businesses.

A Procurement Strategy Meeting (PSM) was held on June 27, 2014 at Langley and the Procurement Strategy was subsequently approved. The procurement for Tracks A, C, D, and E was conducted as full and open competition, while the procurement for Track B was conducted as a 100% Set-Aside for Small Business competition.

A Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) was issued on August 10, 2014 for comments from industry. A Pre-Solicitation Conference was held on August 12-13, 2014 at Langley with over 40 companies attending, including small businesses, large businesses, and independent consultants.

The final RFP was released on September 23, 2014 and had a response date of October 23, 2014. Subsequently, two amendments followed:

Amendment 1: Issued October 10, 2014 to change the email address of the NASA Contract Specialist in the Instructions of the Past Performance Questionnaire.

Amendment 2: Issued October 15, 2014 to extend the hour and date specified for receipt of offers to 1400 EST on October 30, 2014.

Additionally, responses to industry questions on the RFP were posted on October 10, 15, 22, and 28, 2014.

The following Offerors responded to the RFP by the due date of October 30, 2014:

Name of Offeror	Hereinafter referred to as	Small or Large Business	Technical Track Proposed
Alliant Techsystems Operations, LLC	ATK	Large	A, C, D
Analytical Services and Materials, Inc.	AS&M	Small	A, C
Aurora Flight Sciences Corporation	Aurora	Small	A, E
Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc.	Bell	Large	A
The Boeing Company	Boeing	Large	A, C, D, E
Engility Corporation	Engility	Large	E
Honeywell International, Inc.	Honeywell	Large	E
Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company	Lockheed	Large	A, C
Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation Aerospace Systems	NGAS	Large	A, D, E
Northrop Grumman Corporation, Electronic Systems Sector	NGES	Large	D
Rockwell Collins, Inc.	Rockwell	Large	E
Saab Sensis Corporation	Saab	Large	E
ViGYAN, Inc.	ViGYAN	Small	A, B, C, D, E

Note: The proposal submitted by Bell did not include the required evidence that it held either an ISO 9001 or AS9100 certification as of the date of proposal submission and therefore in accordance with Provision M.2(f) of the solicitation the SEB did not evaluate this proposal. Bell was notified of such on November 24, 2014.

### **EVALUATION FACTORS**

The appointed Source Evaluation Board (SEB) conducted an evaluation of all acceptable proposals received in response to the RFP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the four evaluation factors contained in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, of the RFP. The Offerors were evaluated in alphabetical order within each track. The RFP set forth the following four evaluation factors:

- Factor 1: Past Performance
- Factor 2: Cost/Price
- Factor 3: Small Business Utilization Plan
- Factor 4: Organizational Conflicts of Interest

The RFP stated that contracts would be awarded to those responsible Offerors that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. In addition, the RFP stated that the Source Selection Authority (SSA) would make an integrated assessment of each offer and comparatively evaluate competing offers, considering input from the SEB. The SSA would consider the SEB's confidence ratings assigned for Past Performance (Factor 1), the strengths and weaknesses assigned for both Small Business Utilization Plan (Factor 3) and Organizational Conflicts of Interest (Factor 4), and evaluated Cost/Price (Factor 2). The RFP stated that overall, in the selection of an Offeror for contract award, the

Past Performance Factor is significantly more important than the Cost/Price Factor. The Cost/Price Factor is somewhat more important than the Small Business Utilization Plan Factor or Organizational Conflicts of Interest Factor which are essentially equal.

Additionally, the RFP stated that the Government intends to award up to 5 contracts for each of the Tracks A, C, D, and E, and up to 3 contracts for Track B to Offerors that represent the best value to the Government in accordance with NFS 1815.305-71(b).

### **Factor 1 – Past Performance**

Under the Past Performance Factor for each individual Track, the SEB assessed each Offeror's record (to include the record of any significant subcontractors) of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation and assigned pertinence and performance ratings to develop the confidence level. The Offeror had to meet the requirements of both the pertinence and performance components to achieve a particular rating. Pursuant to NFS 1815.305(a)(2), the SEB did not assign strengths and weaknesses to the Past Performance evaluations.

Specifically, the RFP stated that:

“NASA will evaluate each Offeror's current/recent record (including the record of any significant subcontractors, but not the past performance of individuals who are proposed to be involved in the required work), of performing services or delivering products as demonstrated on the individual contracts offered for relevance, that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government will evaluate the relevance of past performance of the prime and each significant subcontractor as it relates to the Statement of Work Track(s) proposed. The confidence rating assigned to Past Performance (see confidence ratings definitions below) will reflect consideration of information contained in the proposal, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and data NASA obtains from other sources. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating Past Performance Ratings.

NASA will evaluate size, content, and complexity information for each Technical Track for which the Offeror submits a proposal.

**Size Guideline:** The Government will evaluate the Offerors' relevant referenced contracts. Relevant referenced contracts with annual values of work less than the values listed below will be considered Not Pertinent, as defined in M.3 (a)(1), with respect to size:

Technical Tracks	Minimum Annual Value of Work Ordered
Track A: Advanced Materials and Structural Systems Aerodynamics, Aerothermodynamics, and Acoustics	\$500K
Track B: Systems Analysis and Concepts	\$15K
Track C: Entry, Decent, and Landing	\$25K
Track D: Measurement Systems and Autonomous Technologies	\$40K
Track E: Flight-Critical and Intelligent Flight Systems	\$50K

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "pertinence" component. The Offeror must meet the requirements of **both** components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing pertinence, the Government will consider the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance."

Rating Definitions:

The SEB used the following confidence level ratings specified in Provision M.3 (a)(1) to evaluate the Past Performance Factor.

**Very High Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**High Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Moderate Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Low Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. \*\* (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)

**Very Low Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more sections; remedial action required in one or more sections; problems in one or more sections which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Neutral:** In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

### **Factor 2 – Cost/Price**

The RFP did not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Factor; however, the RFP provided evaluation language within Section M as follows:

“In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b), the Government will conduct a price analysis. Specifically, the evaluations will include, but are not limited to: (i) comparing the Offerors' rates proposed in response to this solicitation (see next Para) and (ii) comparing the proposed rates to historical rates for the same or similar items purchased by the Government.

In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d), the Government will conduct a cost realism analysis of the proposed rates.”

### **Factor 3 – Small Business Utilization Plan**

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to Small Business Program applied to all Offerors, except that Small Businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For each Track (except Track B) for which an Offeror submitted a proposal, the Offeror was required to propose appropriate subcontracting goals based on the goals recommended in Provision L.20(a)(1)(ii). The SEB evaluated the Offerors' Commitment to the Small Business Program and assigned strengths and weaknesses as appropriate. The RFP did not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under this Factor. The SEB evaluated the Small Business Utilization Plan Factor in accordance with evaluation criteria specified in Provision M.3(c) as follows:

“(a) Small Business Subcontracting:

(1) The Small Business Subcontracting Plan (in the case of small businesses see (a)(2), below) will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement as SEB forth in the RFP in Table at L.20(a)(1). The Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements. The evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be on the basis of total contract value.

(2) Small businesses are not required to submit subcontracting plans. NASA will only evaluate the amount of work proposed to be performed by the small business prime and any small business at the first tier subcontract level. The proposed amount of work to be done by the prime small business and first tier small business subcontractors will be evaluated against

the Contracting Officer's assessment of the overall subcontracting goal for this procurement. Individual subcontracting goals by small business categories will not be evaluated for small business primes and their first tier subcontractors.

(b) Commitment to Small Businesses

(1) NASA will evaluate the extent to which any work performed by a small business as prime or subcontractor(s) is identified as "high technology." NASA also will evaluate the extent of commitment to use the prime or the subcontractor(s) (enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments.)

(2) NASA will evaluate the extent to which the identity of the small business subcontractor is specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use small businesses. (For small business Offerors, NASA will evaluate the extent of commitment that the prime will perform the work and subcontracting commitments only if subcontracting opportunities exist).

(3) NASA will evaluate 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."

In accordance with FAR 15.001, Definitions, the SEB used the following definitions for classification of findings:

**Deficiency:** is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

**Weakness:** means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

**Significant Weakness:** in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

The definitions for Strength and Significant Strength are not in the FAR, however, the SEB used the following definitions for classification of findings:

**Strength:** An aspect of the proposal that increases the probability of successful contract performance.

**Significant Strength:** An aspect of the proposal that appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance

**Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest**

The evaluation of the Organizational Conflicts of Interest Plan applied to all Offerors. The SEB evaluated the Offerors' OCI Plans and assigned strengths and weaknesses as appropriate. The RFP did not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under this Factor. The SEB evaluated the OCI Plan in accordance with the evaluation criteria SEB forth in Provision M.3(d) as follows:

“(a) NASA will determine the acceptability of the Offeror's plan for complying with the requirements of NFS 1852.237-72, Access to Sensitive Information; H.3, Limitation Of Future Contracting; and H.10, Organizational Conflicts of Interest. NASA will evaluate the Offeror's approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding Organizational Conflict of Interest that may arise under this contract in an Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan. Additionally, NASA's evaluation of the acceptability of the Offeror's Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan will be based on the demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCI's and proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

(b) NASA will evaluate the acceptability of the Offeror's Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan that addresses, at a minimum, the following:

(i) an assessment of the potential risk for various types of OCI such as access to sensitive, or non-public information, impaired objectivity, and developing specifications/work statements;

(ii) the process for identifying conflicts, including the coordination with each of its parent, subsidiaries, affiliates, office locations, divisions, joint ventures, and/or other similar entities(collectively, the “Business Units”) to determine whether OCIs currently exist;

(iii) the approach for maintaining communication with each Business Unit during the performance of this contract to identify potential OCIs arising during such performance period;

(iv) the approach to training and refresher training for its employees;

(v) the methods the Offeror will utilize to mitigate the various types of OCIs, once identified;

(vi) the approach for ensuring the processes and procedures included herein will be applied to each of its subcontractors and/or consultants (including their respective Business Units).”

### **EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

Prior to issuance of the RFP, an SEB was appointed to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The SEB conducted the evaluation of proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The RFP required Offerors to submit proposals by the proposal due date in four volumes.

**Volume I - Past Performance Proposal:** Offerors were required to include past performance information specifically tailored to each Track for which they proposed.

**Volume II - Business Proposal:** Offerors were required to include Quality Certifications, Standard Form 33 and Executed Offer, Sections B – J of the Model Contract, and completed Representations and Certifications (Section K). Offerors were also required to include their Cost/Price Proposal specifically tailored to each Track for which they proposed.

**Volume III - Small Business Utilization Proposal:** Offerors were required to submit a Small Business Utilization Plan for Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small

Business Program specifically tailored for each Track for which they proposed. Small businesses were not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

Volume IV – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Plan: Offerors were required to include an OCI plan that covered all Tracks for which they proposed.

The SEB, in coordination with the Contract Specialist and the Contracting Officer (CO), conducted an initial review of the proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of Unacceptable Proposals". For Volume II – Business Proposal, all Offerors were required to submit evidence that its Quality System was Certified/Registered to either the ISO 9001 or AS9100 standard as of the date of proposal submission. The Langley Management System Representative and the SEB reviewed the Quality Certifications submitted by the Offerors and determined that all Offerors, except for Bell as previously noted, submitted the required Quality Certifications that were correctly tailored to the specific work activities to be conducted under the BAART contract. Provision M.2(f) of the RFP specified that any proposal that did not include such evidence would not be evaluated. Therefore, the proposal submitted by Bell was not further evaluated and returned via certified letter on November 24, 2014. The SEB reviewed the remaining proposals. For each Track, the SEB members individually evaluated each proposal and assigned relevance ratings for past performance. The CO gathered and consolidated customer performance ratings for each Offeror per Track. During a consensus process, individual evaluators' relevance and performance ratings were reviewed, consolidated, and used to reach a consensus rating for each Offeror per Track. Additionally, a Pricing Report was prepared by the Cost/Price Analyst in consultation with the SEB and used by the SEB to develop cost findings for each Offeror per Track. Each Offeror's Small Business Utilization was evaluated and the consensus findings were used to assign strengths and weaknesses per Track. Finally, the OCI plans were evaluated and the consensus findings were used to assign consolidated strengths and weaknesses. A Consolidated Consensus Report containing all of the SEB ratings and findings was then generated.

The CO carefully reviewed the facts presented in the initial findings and discussed the findings with the SEB. The RFP included Provision FAR 52.215-1(f)(4) which specified the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award contracts without discussions. The CO determined that, based on the SEB's initial findings, discussions were required and award without discussions could not be made. On May 11, 2015, the CO established a competitive range for Technical Tracks A and E that was comprised of the most highly rated proposals.

Track A: The Contracting Officer determined that AS&M, ATK, Aurora, Boeing, Lockheed, and NGAS were among the most highly rated proposals and included in the competitive range. The Contracting Officer also determined the ViGYAN proposal was not among the most highly rated proposals and was excluded from the competitive range.

Track E: The Contracting Officer determined that Aurora, Boeing, Engility, Honeywell, NGAS, Rockwell, and Saab were among the most highly rated proposals and included in the competitive range. The Contracting Officer also determined the ViGYAN proposal was not among the most highly rated proposals and was excluded from the competitive range.

Only one proposal was received for Track B. Additionally, the number of proposals received for Tracks C and D (5 respectively) equaled the number of awards contemplated. As such, in accordance with NFS 1815.305-71, the CO determined that the solicitation for Tracks B, C, and D was not flawed or unduly restrictive. Based upon market research there was a reasonable

expectation that two or more independent small businesses could compete for work set aside for Track B and there would be more than five large and small businesses competing independently for Tracks C and D. Following a review of the solicitation requirements and the results of market research, the CO determined that the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive.

In accordance with NFS 1815.305-71 and based on the initial SEB proposal reviews presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) on May 28, 2015, the SSA concurred with the CO determination to enter into discussions with the following Offerors for Tracks B, C, and D.

Track B: The CO determined that the proposal submitted by ViGYAN to be included in the competitive range.

Track C: The CO determined all Offerors that submitted a proposal were among the most highly rated proposals and were included in the competitive range. These Offerors are AS&M, ATK, Boeing, Lockheed, and ViGYAN.

Track D: The CO determined that ATK, Boeing, NGAS, and ViGYAN were among the most highly rated proposals and included in the competitive range. The CO also determined that the NGES proposal was not among the most highly rated proposals and was excluded from the competitive range.

On June 15, 2015, the CO notified NGES (Track D) and ViGYAN (Tracks A and E) that their proposals were excluded from the competitive range. On June 15, 2015, the CO notified AS&M (Tracks A and C), ATK (Tracks A, C, and D), Aurora (Tracks A and E), Boeing (Tracks A, C, D, and E), Engility Track E), Honeywell (Track E), Lockheed (Tracks A and C), NGAS (Tracks A, D, and E), Rockwell (Track E), Saab (Track E), and ViGYAN (Tracks B, C, and D), that their proposals were included in the competitive range.

Discussion questions were issued on June 15, 2015 to each of the eleven Offerors providing them an opportunity to address selected aspects of their proposal(s) identified as a result of the evaluation process described above. Where needed, additional discussion questions were issued on July 20, 2015 to address responses to prior discussion questions. All responses were reviewed and evaluated by the SEB.

Final Proposal Revisions were requested on August 6, 2015 with a response date of August 12, 2015.

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **Factor 1- Past Performance**

Regarding the “pertinence” component of the Past Performance Factor, for each Track the SEB:

In considering size, evaluated the relevance of size considering the degree of similarity in size of contracts submitted to the size of the BAART contract; however, in determining an overall rating for size, the SEB considered the past performance of both the prime contractor and all significant subcontractors (if applicable).

In considering content, assigned a pertinence rating to specific PWS sections and used these ratings to assign an overall content rating.

In considering complexity, considered a number of factors that included, but were not limited to, the range of the scope of work to be performed (e.g. conduct of basic and/or applied research and/or development of advanced technologies related to aerospace) and whether the team member performed as a prime or subcontractor for the relevant contract.

The SEB applied the following key for "Pertinence Ratings" across all Tracks:

VHP	Very Highly Pertinent
HP	Highly Pertinent
SP	Somewhat Pertinent
P	Pertinent
NP	Not Pertinent
DNA	Did Not Address

Regarding the "performance" component of the Past Performance Factor for each Track, the SEB evaluated the Offeror teams' (prime and significant subcontractors) past performance records in accordance with Section M.3 of the RFP. The SEB considered the Offeror teams' records in performing contracts similar in size, content, and complexity to the BAART requirements for the prime and significant subcontractors.

Both the "Pertinence" (size, content, and complexity) and the "Performance" records of each Offeror and significant subcontractor were evaluated. A confidence rating was then assigned in accordance with Section M.3(a)(1) of the RFP and NFS 1815.305.

Set forth below by Track is a summary of the final Past Performance Findings for each Offeror in the competitive range.

### **TRACK A**

Offeror	"Pertinence" Component Rating (size / content / complexity)	"Performance" Component Rating	Confidence Rating
AS&M	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Moderate
ATK	Highly Pertinent (SP / HP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
Aurora	Pertinent (SP / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
Boeing	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP / VHP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
Lockheed	Highly Pertinent (SP / HP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
NGAS	Highly Pertinent (P / HP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High

### **AS&M**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**Moderate**" to the AS&M's team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

AS&M presented a total of nine relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the AS&M team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, AS&M received a **Very Highly Pertinent** rating because the AS&M team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, the AS&M team received an overall rating of **Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the AS&M team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the team's significant breadth, indicated by experience in all of the PWS. However, the team demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in only a few PWS sections, including durability, damage tolerance, and reliability; structural mechanics and concepts; and computational modeling and simulation. The team demonstrated limited experience in flow physics and control, and aerothermodynamics. The SEB noted that much of the AS&M team's experience in computational modeling and simulation was obtained in a support role using Government computing equipment rather than in a lead research role.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the nine referenced contracts submitted by the AS&M team and determined that the preponderance of the referenced contracts demonstrated experience conducting basic and applied research and development of similar complexity to Technical Track A. However, a few contracts demonstrated experience providing on-site engineering support services using Government-furnished resources, instead of conducting off-site, contractor-led research and development using contractor resources. In addition, the SEB noted that AS&M performed as the prime contractor for one of its two referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the AS&M team to be **of Similar Complexity** to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to AS&M and its significant subcontractors by the past performance references for each contract and/or instrument and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Exemplary**".

### **ATK**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**High**" to ATK's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ATK presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, ATK received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, ATK received a **Somewhat Pertinent** rating because ATK demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Somewhat Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, ATK received an overall rating of **Highly Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by ATK in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted ATK's significant breadth, indicated by experience in nearly all sections of the PWS. In addition, ATK demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in several PWS sections, including advanced materials and structures; durability, damage tolerance and reliability; structural mechanics and concepts; configuration aerodynamics; aerothermodynamics; and hypersonic airbreathing propulsion. The SEB noted ATK's depth of experience developing and analyzing vehicle configurations and components subject to severe thermal and structural constraints encountered in hypersonic flight. ATK demonstrated limited experience in computational modeling and simulation, flow physics and control, and did not demonstrate experience in vehicle noise prediction and control.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by ATK and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track A. In addition, the SEB noted that ATK performed as the prime contractor for all of its referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of ATK to be **of Similar Complexity** to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to ATK by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Very Effective"**.

### **Aurora**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"Moderate"** to Aurora's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Aurora presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Aurora received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, Aurora received a **Somewhat Pertinent** rating because Aurora demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Somewhat Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, Aurora received an overall rating of **Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Aurora in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Aurora's breadth, indicated by experience in several PWS sections. However, Aurora

demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in one PWS section, model systems. Aurora demonstrated experience in advanced materials and structures; durability, damage tolerance, and reliability; structural mechanics and concepts; and configuration aerodynamics. The SEB noted Aurora's experience investigating and developing materials to enable 3D manufacturing of models and vehicle components for aerospace applications. Aurora demonstrated limited experience in structural dynamics and computational modeling and simulation. Aurora did not demonstrate experience in flow physics and control; aerothermodynamics; hypersonic airbreathing propulsion; and vehicle noise prediction and control.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Aurora and determined that the work performed under two of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track A. In addition, the SEB noted that Aurora performed as the prime contractor for one of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Aurora to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Aurora by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Very Effective**".

### **Boeing**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**High**" to Boeing's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Boeing presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Boeing received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Very Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Boeing received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because Boeing demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, Boeing received an overall rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Boeing in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Boeing's significant breadth and depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in all but one PWS section. The referenced contracts demonstrated Boeing's experience conducting research in a task-order environment across a range of flight conditions and covering a range of maturity levels, from concept studies to successful flight tests.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Boeing and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track A. In addition, the SEB noted that Boeing performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Boeing to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Boeing by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **“Very Effective”**.

### **Lockheed**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **“High”** to Lockheed’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Lockheed presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Lockheed received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, Lockheed received a **Somewhat Pertinent** rating because Lockheed demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Somewhat Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, Lockheed received an overall rating of **Highly Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Lockheed in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Lockheed’s significant breadth, indicated by experience in nearly all sections of the PWS. In addition, Lockheed demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in several PWS sections, including advanced materials and structures; durability, damage tolerance and reliability; structural mechanics and concepts; structural dynamics; and configuration aerodynamics. Lockheed also demonstrated experience in computational modeling and simulation; hypersonic airbreathing propulsion; vehicle noise prediction and control; and model systems. Lockheed did not demonstrate experience in aerothermodynamics, and flow physics and control.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts by Lockheed and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track A. In addition, the SEB noted that Lockheed performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Lockheed to be **of Similar Complexity** to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Lockheed by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **“Very Effective”**.

### **NGAS**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **“High”** to NGAS’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

NGAS presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, NGAS received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, NGAS received a Pertinent rating because NGAS demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Pertinent, with none having a higher rating than Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track A, NGAS received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by NGAS in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted its breadth, indicated by experience in several PWS sections. NGAS demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in several PWS sections, including advanced materials and structures; durability, damage tolerance and reliability; structural mechanics and concepts; configuration aerodynamics; computational modeling and simulation; flow physics and control; and vehicle noise prediction and control. NGAS also demonstrated experience in model systems. However, NGAS did not demonstrate experience in structural dynamics; aerothermodynamics; and hypersonic airbreathing propulsion.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by NGAS and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track A. In addition, the SEB noted that NGAS performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of NGAS to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to NGAS by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **“Very Effective”**.

## **TRACK B**

Only ViGYAN submitted a proposal for Track B.

Offeror	“Pertinence” Component Rating (size /content / complexity)	“Performance” Component Rating	Confidence Rating
ViGYAN	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Moderate

## **ViGYAN**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “Moderate” to the ViGYAN’s team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track A of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ViGYAN presented a total of eight relevant past performance references, of which only seven contracts were evaluated. One contract was determined not to be current since the period of performance ended more than three years before the issuance of the BAART solicitation.

Pertinence: Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the ViGYAN team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, the ViGYAN team received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because the ViGYAN team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track B, the ViGYAN team received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the ViGYAN team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the team's significant breadth, indicated by experience in nearly all PWS sections. However, depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, was demonstrated in two PWS sections: subsystems integration and systems analysis tools. The team did not demonstrate experience analyzing operational factors of aerospace systems.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the seven relevant referenced contracts submitted by the ViGYAN team and determined that all members of the ViGYAN team had some experience conducting basic and applied research in systems analysis and concepts at the same level of complexity as Technical Track B. This included analysis and studies of complex aerospace components and systems, and trade studies of technology impacts on aerospace systems. However, the SEB noted that one referenced contract for significant subcontractor HISS demonstrated experience providing senior engineering staff for basic design tasks and facility and documentation support, which was determined not to be at the same level of complexity as Technical Track B. In addition, the SEB noted that ViGYAN performed as a subcontractor for its referenced contract. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the ViGYAN team to be of Similar Complexity to Technical Track B of the BAART requirements.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to ViGYAN and its significant subcontractors by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Exemplary**".

### **TRACK C**

Offeror	"Pertinence" Component Rating (size / content / complexity)	"Performance" Component Rating	Confidence Rating
AS&M	Highly Pertinent (VHP / HP / Of Similar)	Exemplary	High
ATK	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
Boeing	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP / VHP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
Lockheed	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Moderate
ViGYAN	Somewhat Pertinent (VHP / SP / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Low

### **AS&M**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**High**" to the AS&M's team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track C of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

AS&M presented a total of seven relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the AS&M team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, the AS&M team received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because the AS&M team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track C, the AS&M team received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the AS&M team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the AS&M's team's significant breadth, indicated by experience in all PWS sections. The team demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in two PWS sections: EDL concept development and analysis and testing.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the seven referenced contracts submitted by the AS&M team and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track C. In addition, the SEB noted that AS&M performed as the prime contractor for one of its two referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the AS&M team to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to the AS&M team by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Exemplary**".

### **ATK**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**Moderate**" to ATK's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track C of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ATK presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, ATK received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, ATK received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because ATK demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track C, ATK received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by ATK. The SEB noted ATK's significant breadth, indicated by experience in all PWS sections. ATK's experience in all three sections was rated Pertinent. Based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated in ATK's referenced contracts, the SEB rated the overall content of ATK as Pertinent.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by ATK and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track C. In addition, the SEB noted that ATK performed as the prime contractor for one of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of ATK to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to ATK by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Very Effective"**.

### **Boeing**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"High"** to Boeings' ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track C of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Boeing presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Boeing received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Very Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Boeing received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because Boeing demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track C, Boeing received an overall rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Boeing its referenced contracts. The SEB noted the significant breadth and depth of Boeing's experience, indicated by Very Highly Pertinent ratings in all PWS sections.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Boeing and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track C. In addition, the SEB noted that Boeing performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Boeing to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Boeing by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Very Effective"**.

### **Lockheed**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"Moderate"** to Lockheed's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track C of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Lockheed presented a total of three relevant past performance references. One contract was determined not to be current since the period of performance ended more than three years before the issuance of the BAART solicitation.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Lockheed received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Lockheed received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because Lockheed demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track C, Lockheed received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Lockheed in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Lockheed's significant breadth, indicated by experience in all PWS sections. Lockheed demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in EDL concept development. Lockheed demonstrated limited experience in enabling technologies for EDL.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the two referenced contracts submitted by Lockheed and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track C. In addition, the SEB noted that Lockheed performed as the prime contractor for each of its two referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Lockheed to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Lockheed by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Exemplary**".

#### **VIGYAN**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**Low**" to the ViGYAN's team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track C of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ViGYAN presented a total of six relevant past performance references. One contract was determined not to be current since the period of performance ended more than three years before the issuance of the BAART solicitation.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the ViGYAN team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Somewhat Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, the ViGYAN team received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because the ViGYAN team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track C, the ViGYAN team received an overall rating of Somewhat Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the ViGYAN team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the team's limited breadth, indicated by experience in one PWS section. The team did not demonstrate depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in any PWS section. The team's single pertinent rating was in analysis and testing.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the five referenced contracts submitted by the ViGYAN team and determined that the preponderance of the referenced contracts demonstrated experience conducting basic and applied research and development of similar complexity to Technical Track C. However, a few contracts demonstrated experience providing on-site engineering support services using Government-furnished resources, instead of conducting off-site, contractor-led research and development using contractor resources. In addition, the SEB noted that ViGYAN performed as a subcontractor for its referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the ViGYAN team to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirements.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to the ViGYAN team by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Exemplary**”.

### **TRACK D**

Offeror	“Pertinence” Component Rating (size / content / complexity)	“Performance” Component Rating	Confidence Rating
ATK	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
Boeing	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
NGAS	Highly Pertinent (VHP / HP / Of Similar)	Effective	Moderate
ViGYAN	Somewhat Pertinent (VHP / SP / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Low

### **ATK**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “**Moderate**” to ATK’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track D of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ATK presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

Pertinence: Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, ATK received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, ATK received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because ATK demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track D, ATK received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by ATK in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted ATK’s breadth, indicated by experience in most PWS sections. ATK demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in two PWS sections, including *in situ* sensors and systems and autonomous technologies. ATK also demonstrated experience in remote sensing systems, and demonstrated limited experience in advanced sensors and

transducer arrays. ATK did not demonstrate experience in nondestructive evaluation and large and high-speed data management.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by ATK and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track D. In addition, the SEB noted that ATK performed as the prime contractor for one of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of ATK to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to ATK by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Very Effective**”.

### **Boeing**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “**Moderate**” to Boeings ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track D of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Boeing presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

Pertinence: Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Boeing received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, Boeing received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because Boeing demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track D, Boeing received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Boeing in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Boeing's breadth, indicated by experience in most PWS sections. Boeing demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in two PWS sections, including *in situ* sensors and systems and autonomous technologies. Boeing did not demonstrate experience in remote sensing systems, and large and high-speed data management. Boeing demonstrated limited experience in nondestructive evaluation and advanced sensors and transducer arrays.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Boeing and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track D. In addition, the SEB noted that Boeing performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Boeing to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Boeing by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Very Effective**”.

## **NGAS**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “**Moderate**” to NGAS’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track D of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

NGAS presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, NGAS received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, NGAS received a **Very Highly Pertinent** rating because NGAS demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track D, NGAS team received an overall rating of **Highly Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by NGAS in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted NGAS’s significant breadth, indicated by experience in all PWS sections. NGAS demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in a few PWS sections, including *in situ* sensors and systems; remote sensing systems; and autonomous technologies. NGAS demonstrated limited experience in advanced sensors and transducer arrays; and large and high speed data management.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by NGAS and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track D. In addition, the SEB noted that NGAS performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of NGAS to be **of Similar Complexity** to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to NGAS by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Effective**”.

## **ViGYAN**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “**Low**” to the ViGYAN’s team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track D of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

ViGYAN presented a total of five relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the ViGYAN team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Somewhat Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, the ViGYAN team received a **Very Highly Pertinent** rating because the ViGYAN team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track D, the ViGYAN team received an overall rating of Somewhat Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the ViGYAN team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the ViGYAN team's breadth, indicated by experience in most PWS sections. The ViGYAN team did not demonstrate depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in any PWS section. The team demonstrated experience with *in situ* sensors and systems; remote sensing systems; and large and high speed data management. The team demonstrated limited experience with autonomous technologies, and did not demonstrate experience with nondestructive evaluation technologies and advanced sensor development.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the five referenced contracts submitted by the ViGYAN team. The SEB determined that the work performed under the referenced contract submitted by ViGYAN was not of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track D. The SEB determined that the work performed under the four referenced contracts submitted for significant subcontractors was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track D. In addition, the SEB noted that ViGYAN performed as the prime contractor for its referenced contract. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the ViGYAN team to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to the ViGYAN team by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Exemplary"**.

## TRACK E

Offeror	"Pertinence" Component Rating (size / content / complexity)	"Performance" Component Rating	Confidence Rating
Aurora	Pertinent (P / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
Boeing	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Very Effective	Moderate
Engility	Pertinent (VHP / P / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Moderate
Honeywell	Very Highly Pertinent (HP / VHP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
NGAS	Highly Pertinent (VHP / HP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High
Rockwell	Pertinent (HP / P / Of Similar)	Exemplary	Moderate
Saab	Highly Pertinent (VHP / HP / Of Similar)	Very Effective	High

### Aurora

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"Moderate"** to Aurora's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART contract solicitation on its relevant past performance record.

Aurora presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Aurora received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Aurora received a **Pertinent** rating because Aurora demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, Aurora received an overall rating of **Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Aurora in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Aurora's breadth, indicated by experience in several PWS sections. Aurora demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in a few PWS sections, including integration of vehicle health into guidance and control; multivehicle scenarios; and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies. Aurora also demonstrated experience in situational awareness of flight crews; methods for operational integrity; and systems analyses for flight critical systems. Aurora demonstrated limited experience in guidance and control technologies. Aurora did not demonstrate experience in situational awareness of air traffic control; requirements for human subject experimentation; methods for design integrity; and system safety assurance.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Aurora and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB noted that Aurora performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Aurora to be **of Similar Complexity** to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Aurora by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Very Effective"**.

### **Boeing**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"Moderate"** to Boeing's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Boeing presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Boeing received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Boeing received a **Very Highly Pertinent** rating because Boeing demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, Boeing received an overall rating of **Pertinent** based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Boeing in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Boeing's breadth, indicated by experience in several PWS sections. Boeing demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in a few PWS sections, including

situational awareness of flight crews; situational awareness of air traffic control; system safety assurance; and systems analyses of flight critical systems. Boeing also demonstrated experience with requirements for human subject experimentation, and guidance and control technologies. Boeing did not demonstrate experience with methods for design integrity; methods for operational integrity; integration of vehicle health into guidance and control; multi-vehicle scenarios; and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three relevant referenced contracts submitted by Boeing, and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB noted that Boeing performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Boeing to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to Boeing by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Very Effective**”.

### **Engility**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of “**Moderate**” to the Engility’s team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Engility presented a total of five relevant past performance references.

Pertinence: Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the Engility team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, the Engility team received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because the Engility team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, the Engility team received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the Engility team in the team’s referenced contracts. The SEB noted the Engility’s team significant breadth, indicated by experience in nearly all PWS sections. Engility demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in a few PWS sections, including situational awareness of flight crews; situational awareness of air traffic control; requirements for human subject experimentation; and systems analyses of flight critical systems. The team also demonstrated experience with system safety assurance; methods for operational integrity; guidance and control technologies; multi-vehicle scenarios; and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies. The team demonstrated limited experience in methods for design integrity, and did not demonstrate experience integrating vehicle health into guidance and control.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the five relevant referenced contracts submitted by the Engility team and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB

noted that Engility performed as the prime contractor for two of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the Engility team to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to the Engility team by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **“Exemplary”**.

### **Honeywell**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **“High”** to Honeywell’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Honeywell presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Honeywell an Overall Pertinence rating of **Very Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, Honeywell received a Highly Pertinent rating because Honeywell demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Highly Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, Honeywell received an overall rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Honeywell in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Honeywell’s significant breadth and depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in nearly all PWS sections. Honeywell demonstrated comprehensive coverage of the technologies required in all PWS sections except for multivehicle scenarios, where it demonstrated limited experience.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Honeywell, and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB noted that Honeywell performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Honeywell to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to Honeywell by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **“Very Effective”**.

### **NGAS**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **“High”** to NGAS’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

NGAS presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, NGAS received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, NGAS received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because NGAS demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, NGAS received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by NGAS in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted NGAS's significant breadth, indicated by experience in nearly all PWS sections. In addition, NGAS demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in several PWS sections, including methods to improve situational awareness of flight crews; methods to improve situational awareness of air traffic control; system safety assurance; guidance and control technologies; integrating vehicle health into guidance and control; and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies. NGAS also demonstrated experience with methods for design integrity; methods for operational integrity; systems analyses of flight critical systems; and multivehicle scenarios. NGAS did not demonstrate experience with requirements for human subject experimentation.

For *Complexity Pertinence*, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by NGAS, and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB noted that NGAS performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of NGAS to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

Performance: After considering all of the performance ratings given to NGAS by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of "**Very Effective**".

### Rockwell

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "**Moderate**" to Rockwell's ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Rockwell presented a total of three relevant past performance references.

Pertinence: Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, Rockwell received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Pertinent**.

For *Size Pertinence*, Rockwell received a Highly Pertinent rating because Rockwell demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Highly Pertinent, with none having a higher pertinence rating.

For *Content Pertinence*, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, Rockwell received an overall rating of Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by Rockwell in its referenced contracts. The SEB noted Rockwell's breadth, indicated by experience in several PWS sections. Rockwell demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in a few PWS sections, including methods to improve the situational awareness of flight crews; requirements for human subject experimentation; methods to ensure design integrity; and methods to ensure operational

integrity. Rockwell demonstrated limited experience in a few PWS sections, including situational awareness of air traffic control, and systems analyses of flight critical systems. Rockwell did not demonstrate experience in PWS sections including systems safety assurance; guidance and control technologies; integrating vehicle health into guidance and control; multi-vehicle scenarios; and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the three referenced contracts submitted by Rockwell, and determined that the work performed under each of these contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. In addition, the SEB noted that Rockwell performed as the prime contractor on two of its three referenced contracts. As a result, the SEB considered the overall past performance of Rockwell to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

**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 SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of **"Exemplary"**.

### **Saab**

Based on the following assessment of the past performance data, the SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of **"High"** to the Saab's team ability to successfully perform the requirements of Technical Track E of the BAART solicitation based on its relevant past performance record.

Saab presented a total of twelve relevant past performance references.

**Pertinence:** Considering the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity of each individual contract, the Saab team received an Overall Pertinence rating of **Highly Pertinent**.

For *Size* Pertinence, the Saab team received a Very Highly Pertinent rating because the Saab team demonstrated past performance on one or more relevant contracts determined to be Very Highly Pertinent.

For *Content* Pertinence, as compared to the BAART PWS for Technical Track E, the Saab team received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent based on an integrated assessment of the breadth and depth of experience demonstrated by the Saab team in the team's referenced contracts. The SEB noted the team's significant breadth, indicated by experience in all sections of the PWS. The team demonstrated depth of experience, indicated by a rating higher than Pertinent, in several PWS sections, including situational awareness of flight crews; situational awareness of air traffic control; methods for design integrity; methods for operational integrity; systems analyses of flight critical systems; guidance and control technologies; and multi-vehicle scenarios. The team demonstrated experience in methods for system safety assurance and autonomous and intelligent flight technologies. The team demonstrated limited experience in requirements for human subject experimentation and integration of vehicle health into guidance and control.

For *Complexity* Pertinence, the SEB evaluated the twelve referenced contracts submitted by the Saab team, and determined that the work performed by Saab under each of its referenced contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E, and that the work performed by significant subcontractors under eight of the nine referenced contracts was of similar complexity to the PWS for Technical Track E. The SEB considered the work performed by a significant subcontractor on one of its referenced contracts serving as test operator for a

human-in-the-loop test was not of similar complexity to the BAART PWS. In addition, the SEB noted that Saab performed as the prime contractor for each of its three referenced contracts. Because all but one referenced contract were similar in complexity to the BAART contract, the SEB considered the overall past performance of the Saab team to be of Similar Complexity to the BAART requirement.

**Performance:** After considering all of the performance ratings given to the Saab team by the past performance references for each contract and based on an integrated assessment of these ratings, the SEB assigned an Overall Performance rating of “**Very Effective**”.

### **Factor 2 - Cost/Price**

Price Reasonableness was determined by Adequate Price Competition, Price Analysis (including: (i) comparison of the rates proposed in response to the solicitation and (ii) comparison of the proposed rates to historic rates for the same or similar items purchased by the Government, and Cost Realism Analysis. The direct and indirect rates proposed by all Offerors are considered realistic based upon the cost realism analysis performed by the Cost/Price Analyst. However, some of the proposed (burdened) evaluated average rates are not realistic and therefore required an adjustment. The reason for the specific adjustments is provided below for each applicable Offeror.

### **TRACK A**

A summary ranking of the overall evaluated average rate for Track A is shown in the table below. The “evaluated” average rate refers to the Offeror’s proposed average rate if no changes were required or to the Offeror’s adjusted average rate if changes were required.

Offeror	Evaluated Average Rate
AS&M	1 <sup>st</sup> (Lowest)
ATK	5 <sup>th</sup>
Aurora	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Boeing	4 <sup>th</sup>
Lockheed	6 <sup>th</sup> (Highest)
NGAS	3 <sup>rd</sup>

**AS&M:** No adjustment was made to AS&M’s evaluated average rate.

**ATK:** No adjustment was made to ATK’s evaluated average rate.

**Aurora:** An adjustment was made to Aurora’s evaluated average rate. The proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because it is based only on direct rates and not burdened rates. In accordance with the RFP, Aurora’s adjusted average rate is based on Aurora’s proposed burdened rates.

**Boeing:** An adjustment was made to Boeing’s evaluated average rate. Boeing’s proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for those labor categories that are classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes these indirect labor categories.

**Lockheed**: An adjustment was made to Lockheed's evaluated average rate. Lockheed's evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for those labor categories that are classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes these indirect labor categories.

**NGAS**: No adjustment was made to NGAS' evaluated average rate.

### **TRACK B**

**ViGYAN**: No adjustment was made to ViGYAN's evaluated average rate.

### **TRACK C**

A summary ranking of the overall evaluated average rate for Track C is shown in the table below. The "evaluated" average rate refers to the Offeror's proposed average rate if no changes were required or to the Offeror's adjusted average rate if changes were required.

Offeror	Evaluated Average Rate
AS&M	1 <sup>st</sup> (Lowest)
ATK	4 <sup>th</sup>
Boeing	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Lockheed	5 <sup>th</sup> (Highest)
ViGYAN	2 <sup>nd</sup>

**AS&M**: No adjustment was made to AS&M's evaluated average rate.

**ATK**: No adjustment was made to ATK's evaluated average rate.

**Boeing**: An adjustment was made to Boeing's evaluated average rate. Boeing's proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for the labor category that is classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes this indirect labor category.

**Lockheed**: An adjustments was made to Lockheed's evaluated average rate. Lockheed's proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for those labor categories that are classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes these indirect labor categories.

**ViGYAN**: No adjustment was made to ViGYAN's evaluated average rate.

### **TRACK D**

A summary ranking of the overall evaluated average rate for Track D is shown in the table below. The "evaluated" average rate refers to the Offeror's proposed average rate if no changes were required or to the Offeror's adjusted average rate if changes were required.

Offeror	Evaluated Average Rate
ATK	4 <sup>th</sup>
Boeing	3 <sup>rd</sup>
NGAS	2 <sup>nd</sup>
ViGYAN	1 <sup>st</sup> (Lowest)

**ATK:** No adjustment was made to ATK's evaluated average rate.

**Boeing:** An adjustment was made to Boeing's evaluated average rate. Boeing's proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for those labor categories that are classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes these indirect labor categories.

**NGAS:** No adjustment was made to NGAS's evaluated average rate.

**ViGYAN:** No adjustment was made to ViGYAN's evaluated average rate.

### **TRACK E**

A summary ranking of the overall evaluated average rate for Track E is shown in the table below. The "evaluated" average rate refers to the Offeror's proposed average rate if no changes were required or to the Offeror's adjusted average rate if changes were required.

Offeror	Evaluated Average Rate
Aurora	7 <sup>th</sup> (Highest)
Boeing	4 <sup>th</sup>
Engility	1 <sup>st</sup> (Lowest)
Honeywell	6 <sup>th</sup>
NGAS	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Rockwell	5 <sup>th</sup>
Saab	2 <sup>nd</sup>

**Aurora:** An adjustment was made to Aurora's evaluated average rate. The proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because it is based only on direct rates and not burdened rates. In accordance with the RFP, Aurora's adjusted evaluated average rate is based on Aurora's proposed burdened rates.

**Boeing:** An adjustment was made to Boeing's evaluated average rate. Boeing's proposed evaluated average rate is not realistic because the rate is based on zero dollars per hour for the labor category that is classified as indirect in its accounting system. Calculation of the adjusted evaluated average rate excludes this indirect labor category.

**Engility:** No adjustment was made to Engility's evaluated average rate.

**Honeywell:** No adjustment was made to Honeywell's evaluated average rate.

**NGAS:** No adjustment was made to NGAS's evaluated average rate.

**Rockwell**: No adjustment was made to Rockwell's evaluated average rate.

**Saab**: No adjustment was made to Saab's evaluated average rate.

Based on adequate price competition and the price and cost realism analyses performed (see FAR 15.402), the CO determined that all evaluated burdened rates are fair and reasonable. However, for Aurora (Tracks A and E), Boeing (Tracks A, C, D, and E), and Lockheed (Tracks A and C) the proposed evaluated average rates are not realistic (i.e., too low, for reasons stated above).

### **Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization**

Set forth below is a summary of the final Small Business Utilization Findings for the Offerors in the competitive range.

#### **TRACK A**

##### **ASM**

ASM's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

AS&M's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its proposed significant subcontractors. ASM's approach also provided insight into the extent of its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to use its significant subcontractors.

##### **ATK**

ATK's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

##### **Aurora**

Aurora's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, or significant weaknesses.

Aurora received a weakness for providing no evidence of established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach. Aurora indicated it is committed to utilizing small businesses and proposes to do all of the anticipated work under Track A for BAART to ensure its Commitment to Small Business, and further stated that should subcontractors be needed it will use small businesses to maximum extent possible.

##### **Boeing**

Boeing's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Boeing's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its significant subcontractors. Boeing's approach demonstrated its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to its significant subcontractors.

**Lockheed**

Lockheed final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, or significant weaknesses.

Lockheed received a weakness for its response that addressed many of the requirements as specified in the Small Business Utilization Plan Factor in accordance with the RFP. However, the response did not provide specific subcontracting goals and dollars or the methods used to develop the goals. Instead Lockheed stated that it would strive to establish goals that meet or exceed the Contracting Officer's assessment of goals to be achieved.

**NGAS**

NGAS's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**TRACK B****ViGYAN**

ViGYAN's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**TRACK C****AS&M**

ASM's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

AS&M's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its proposed significant subcontractors. ASM's approach also provided insight into the extent of its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to use its significant subcontractors.

**ATK**

ATK's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Boeing**

Boeing's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Boeing's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its significant subcontractors. Boeing's approach demonstrated its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to its significant subcontractors.

**Lockheed**

Lockheed's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, or significant weaknesses.

Lockheed received a weakness for its response which addressed many of the requirements as specified in the Small Business Utilization Plan Factor in accordance with the RFP. However, the response did not provide specific subcontracting goals and dollars or the methods used to develop the goal. Instead Lockheed stated that it would strive to establish goals that meet or exceed the Contracting Officer's assessment of goals to be achieved.

**VIGYAN**

VIGYAN's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**TRACK D**

**ATK**

ATK's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Boeing**

Boeing's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Boeing's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its significant subcontractors. Boeing's approach demonstrated its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to its significant subcontractors.

**NGAS**

NGAS's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**ViGYAN**

ViGYAN's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**TRACK E**

**Aurora**

Aurora's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, or significant weaknesses.

Aurora received a weakness for providing no evidence of established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach. Aurora indicated it is committed to utilizing small businesses and proposes to do all of the anticipated work under Track E for BAART to ensure its Commitment to Small Business, and further stated that should subcontractors be needed it will use small businesses to maximum extent possible.

**Boeing**

Boeing's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Boeing's received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its significant subcontractors. Boeing's approach demonstrated its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to its significant subcontractors.

**Engility**

Engility's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Honeywell**

Honeywell's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**NGAS**

NGAS's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Rockwell**

Rockwell's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Saab**

Saab's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Saab received a strength for its discussion of Commitment to Small Business which identified the significant small business subcontractors for work to be performed under the Performance Work Statement. Also included were signed letters of commitment for each of its proposed significant subcontractors. Saab's approach also provided insight into the extent of its commitment (enforceable vs. non-enforceable) to use its significant subcontractors.

**Factor 4 - Organizational Conflicts of Interest**

Set forth below is a summary of the final Organizational Conflicts of Interest Findings for the Offerors in the competitive range.

**AS&M (Tracks A and C)**

AS&M's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

AS&M received a strength for its process for identifying conflicts which includes an up-to-date database of all active and completed contracts (within three years) which will be used by the Program Manager, task manager and task leads to ensure compliance with the BAART contract. AS&M's use of this database will enhance its ability to identify potential OCIs quickly.

AS&M received a strength for its approach for ensuring the processes and procedures included will be applied to each of its subcontractors and/or consultants to protect other companies' information from unauthorized use or disclosure, and will not release information without obtaining approval from the affected third party. This affirmative requirement and formal SEB of

agreements to protect information provides a documented method to prevent improper release of sensitive information.

AS&M also received a strength for its proposed approach to training and refresher training for its employees. The Program Manager will conduct annual training and distribute a copy of the OCI plan to all personnel performing under the contract. Further, all employees, subcontractors and consultants will be required to update their nondisclosure agreements, OCI representation statements, and OCI/PCI questionnaires annually. In addition, new employees will be trained at the time of their employment. AS&M's proactive approach to training and refresher training ensures all personnel working on the BAART contract are aware of their responsibilities and understand the rules regarding OCIs.

**ATK (Tracks A, C, and D)**

ATK's final proposal evaluation contained a strength as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

ATK received a strength for its approach for identifying conflicts, including the coordination with its Business Units, which includes techniques for coordination within the divisions of the company. ATK's systematic approach ensures awareness of potential OCIs within its corporation.

**Aurora (Tracks A and E)**

Aurora's final proposal evaluation contained no significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

**Boeing (Tracks A, C, D, and E)**

Boeing's final proposal evaluation contained strengths. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Boeing received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under the contract and makes use of an OCI database that contains detailed information concerning persons and organizations having access to sensitive information. Boeing's use of this comprehensive database enhances its ability to avoid Access to Information type OCIs and should provide assistance in identifying potential Impaired Objectivity OCIs.

Boeing's proposal evaluation also included a strength for its process for identifying conflicts which includes a disciplined process to determine whether OCIs currently exist and to obtain higher management approval of recommended courses of action to address such OCIs.

**Engility (Track E)**

Engility's final proposal evaluation contained strengths and a weakness as summarized below. There were no significant strengths or significant weaknesses.

Engility received a strength for its process for identifying OCIs. This disciplined process requires all proposed service tasks be reviewed by all business groups to identify any existing or potential conflicts.

Engility also received a strength for its demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs, particularly its approach which

utilizes an effective mitigation technique for identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding impaired objectivity OCIs.

Engility received another strength for its use of methods to mitigate the various types of OCIs. Once OCIs are identified, Engility will use a variety of effective techniques to prevent improper transfer of information to minimize the chances for access to information OCI violations.

Engility received a weakness for the OCI plan accompanying the Final Proposal Revision. The approach for identifying, mitigating, and/or OCIs states it will notify the Contracting Officer of potential OCIs that cannot be avoided within two working days of it concluding an actual or potential OCI exists. Whereas, the contract requires notice within two working days of receipt of a task order, not two days after a contractor concludes an OCI exist. Furthermore, Engility stated that NASA will be notified within two working days of receipt of a task order that creates an actual or potential OCI. It is unclear which proposed process takes precedence when reviewing Task Orders for actual or potential OCIs.

#### **Honeywell (Track E)**

Honeywell's final proposal evaluation contained a strength as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Honeywell received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract. The approach included the use of an anonymous hotline to report OCIs to its corporate headquarters which is an effective communication tool to encourage reporting of potential OCIs.

#### **Lockheed (Tracks A and C)**

Lockheed's final proposal evaluation contained a strength as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Lockheed received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract. The approach included the use of a corporate Ethics Office with responsibility to resolve reported violations of the OCI Plan if not resolved at a lower level and includes contact information to report violations. Lockheed's use of such a process to resolve OCIs at the corporate level is an effective method to demonstrate that its senior management takes its responsibilities with respect to OCIs very seriously.

#### **NGAS (Tracks A, C, and E)**

NGAS's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

NGAS received a strength for its process for identifying conflicts, including the coordination with its Business Units, which utilizes a group of corporate executives to authorize the company's responses to solicitations. Additionally, oversight for a sector's participation in such matters will be provided by the appropriate management personnel.

NGAS also received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract that included a comprehensive list of effective mitigation techniques.

**Rockwell (Track E)**

Rockwell's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Rockwell received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract which includes establishing an Ethics and Business Compliance organization within the Office of the General Counsel to monitor adherence to standards of business conduct and to resolve concerns of employees.

Additionally, Rockwell received a strength for its process for identifying conflicts, including the coordination with its Business Units, which includes use of a disciplined internal management authorization process to review work under the contract. This review process includes representatives from all relevant technology sections and functions to help identify OCIs.

**Saab (Track E)**

Saab's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Saab received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract, which includes use of an OCI Program Official at the corporate level. In addition, this OCI Program Official is responsible for maintaining a complete SEB of OCI plans across the company and the company's Program Manager is responsible for ensuring the requirements of the plan are flowed down to subcontractors and for ensuring subcontractors comply with the plan's requirements. This effective approach for maintaining communication with each Business unit during performance of this contract allows the Offeror to identify conflicts and coordinate with each Business Unit to address potential OCIs in a proactive manner.

Saab also received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract, which includes use of effective techniques to safeguard sensitive information.

**ViGYAN (Tracks B, C, and D)**

ViGYAN's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

ViGYAN received a strength for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract, which includes use of an OCI Manager who is at a corporate level above the Program Manager. Use of a senior level OCI Manager will enhance ViGYAN's ability to capture relevant information across the company and ensure maintaining communications with Each Business Unit.

ViGYAN also received a strength for its process for identifying conflicts, including coordination with each of its Business Units, which requires OCI reviews by its most senior personnel and includes review of all current work related to customers over the past three years and potential future work. This comprehensive review of its past, present and potential future business in making its OCI assessments enhances ViGYAN's ability to identify, mitigate and/or avoid OCIs under the BAART contract.

Additionally, ViGYAN received a strength for its approach for identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract, which includes a comprehensive list of its assessment of the potential risk for various types of OCIs as well as the methods that it will utilize to mitigate the various types of OCIs, once identified. This comprehensive list of potential risks and methods of mitigation demonstrates a sound understanding of the risks for potential OCIs under the BAART contract, and methods to avoid and mitigate those risks.

ViGYAN also received a strength for its approach for ensuring that the processes and procedures will be applied to each of its subcontractors and/or consultants. Providing such close oversight ensures that its subcontractors and/or consultants comply with OCI plans that must be at least as comprehensive as its plan. Additionally, ViGYAN's Plan includes a requirement that such provisions also be flowed down to lower tier subcontractors.

### **BASIS FOR SELECTION/SOURCE SELECTION DECISIONS**

I am convinced that the SEB conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation criteria in Section M of the RFP. I comparatively assessed the proposals against all four evaluation factors in the RFP. I also considered all factors, and their relative importance, in the selection of the Offeror(s) for each Track that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

Provision M.6, Contract Awards, of the RFP, stated that, "The Government intends to award up to 5 contracts for each of the Tracks A, C, D, and E, and up to 3 contracts for Track B that represent the best value to the Government in accordance with NFS 1815.305-71(b)". For the reasons discussed below, I determined it was in the Government's best interests to exceed those numbers in Tracks A and E.

#### **TRACK A**

In making the selection decision for Track A (Advanced Materials and Structural Systems, Aerodynamics, Aerothermodynamics, and Acoustics), I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP for the proposals submitted by AS&M, ATK, Aurora, Boeing, Lockheed, and NGAS.

After reviewing the SEB findings for Factor 1 – Past Performance, it was clear to me that the diversity of the technical experience demonstrated by these Offerors supported the criticality of ensuring sustainable technical coverage of each PWS section for Track A and accordingly necessitates that I select more than the number of awards contemplated for Track A. The BAART contract can be used to support all NASA Centers that require work within the scope of the PWS for Track A, thus providing not only Langley, but also the Agency, the flexibility to accommodate current as well as potential future requirements. As Langley and Agency capability requirements increase, the BAART contract can provide the spectrum of desired contractor experience and capabilities for inclusion in its technical portfolio to meet those needs.

Regarding the technical experience of the Offerors in PWS section A.1, Advanced Materials and Structural Systems, (comprising PWS subsections A.1.1 through A.1.4), I noted that AS&M, ATK, Aurora, Boeing, and Lockheed demonstrated breadth of experience in all of the PWS A.1 subsections. NGAS demonstrated breadth of experience in all but one PWS subsection. Though these Offerors demonstrated breadth of experience, only Lockheed demonstrated depth (rated as HP or VHP) in all PWS A.1 subsections. ATK, Boeing, and NGAS demonstrated

depth of experience in three, AS&M in two, and Aurora in none of the PWS A.1 subsections. I find it is critical to have at least two Offerors with demonstrated depth of experience (rated as VHP or HP) in each PWS A.1 subsection. Having at least two such Offerors in each PWS A.1 subsection would provide not only the breadth, but significant depth of experience in PWS section A.1 for Langley and Agency requirements. In this way, the Agency will be better assured that it can obtain effective competition from highly experienced contractors for Advanced Materials and Structural Systems research work.

I also noted that in PWS section A.2, Aerodynamics, Aerothermodynamics, and Acoustics, (comprising of PWS subsections A.2.1 through A.2.7) the breadth of demonstrated experience in these subsections was not as comprehensive across all Offerors as in PWS section A.1. Both AS&M and Boeing demonstrated breadth of experience in all A.2 PWS subsections. While Boeing demonstrated depth of experience in all subsections, AS&M only demonstrated depth in one subsection. ATK, Lockheed, and NGAS demonstrated breadth of experience in the preponderance of the subsections, but did not demonstrate depth of experience in as many of the subsections. Aurora demonstrated breadth of experience in a few subsections and depth in one subsection. Of importance to me in considering my selection is the Agency's need for capability in PWS subsection A.2.7, Model Systems. Of particular importance to me regarding capability in this subsection is future work involving possible flight demonstrators, such as the Low-Boom Flight Demonstrator, and use of X-planes as well as increased use of wind tunnel models to validate aerospace concepts and designs. NASA's missions are indicating a need for more flight demonstrations to facilitate multi-disciplinary research and integrated technology development. I expect this will be a significant growth area over the next five years for which there will be an increased need for expertise to provide ground test models as well as flight demonstrator aircraft. Only Aurora and Boeing demonstrated depth of experience in this growth PWS section and therefore their experience in Model Systems is important in meeting Agency needs. The lack of breadth and depth among the Offerors does not allow for a robust capability in this PWS subsection if only five Offerors are selected. Only the ability to access the combined demonstrated experience of all Offerors would provide significant depth of experience to Langley and the Agency in PWS section A.2. Therefore, in order to maximize the potential for effective competition in PWS section A.2, I determined it to be in the best interest of the Government to award contracts to all six Offerors. Doing so would eliminate the gaps in breadth of experience identified in PWS section A.2 while retaining capabilities in the PWS section A.1 in which Offerors did demonstrate experience.

Having multiple contractors with depth of experience in all PWS subsections expands the Agency's access to expertise and resources to enhance the Agency's ability to meet its expanding aerospace research and technology development missions in these technical areas. The only way to achieve this level across all Track A PWS sections is to make award to all six Offerors. I determined that by including all of the Offerors for Track A, the Agency would maximize access to the greatest breadth of experience as well as the greatest depth of experience. I therefore determined making award in this manner maximizes the likelihood of obtaining effective competition from highly experienced contractors, maximizes access to small businesses with depth of experience in PWS subsections A.2.2 and A.2.7, and minimizes the technical risk to Agency programs and projects that will be supported by the BAART contractors.

Regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price, I noted that a detailed price analysis of the proposed rates was performed for each Offeror and determined to be reasonable, realistic and reflect a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that two of

the Offerors received a weakness for their Small Business Utilization Response, which I find did not make their overall response to this Factor unacceptable. Therefore, I find that all six Offerors satisfied the RFP requirements for small business subcontracting, or small business utilization, as appropriate to the Offeror's size status, in accordance with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements (applicable only to the four large business Offerors), the subcontracting goals established for Track A of this procurement, and the commitment to the Small Business Program. For Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), I noted that all Plans are considered acceptable based on their demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and their proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

### **Source Selection Decision – Track A**

In conclusion, awarding to all six Offerors in Track A decreases programmatic risk to both Langley and the Agency by allowing access to the depth, as well as breadth, of experience amongst the Offerors needed to achieve mission requirements. If we are to successfully accomplish our mission in the next five years, a diverse portfolio allowing for robust experience across all PWS sections and particularly in emerging technology sections is critical. Awarding a contract to all six Offerors for Track A will realize such technical diversity, increase our ability to contract with small businesses where practicable and achieve potential cost savings from lower average rates offered by small businesses, which ultimately is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government.

Accordingly, I hereby select AS&M, ATK, Aurora, Boeing, Lockheed, and Northrop for award of Track A BAART contracts.

### **TRACK B**

In making the selection decision for Track B (Systems Analysis and Concepts), I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP. Only one proposal from ViGYAN, Inc. was submitted for Track B in response to the solicitation. In accordance with NFS 1815.305-71(a), the Contracting Officer reviewed the solicitation and determined that (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive, and (2) adequate price competition exists based on reasonable expectation of competition and the results of the price reasonableness and cost realism analysis performed.

NFS 1815.305-71(a) also requires that the CO determine if the proposal is an acceptable proposal. The CO reviewed the SEB findings and determined that the proposal submitted by ViGYAN was acceptable. I concur with the findings of the SEB and CO. Specifically, in evaluating Factor 1 - Past Performance, the proposal was determined to be acceptable based on ViGYAN receiving a Moderate Level of Confidence rating as a result of demonstrated pertinent experience, and exemplary performance. Regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price, I noted that a detailed price analysis of the proposed rates was performed and determined to be reasonable, realistic and reflect a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that ViGYAN met the requirements for commitment to the Small Business Program. For Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), I noted that ViGYAN's Plan is acceptable based on its demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

### Source Selection Decision – Track B

For Track B, I find the selection of ViGYAN, Inc. is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government. Accordingly, I select ViGYAN, Inc. for award of a Track B BAART contract.

### TRACK C

In making the selection decision for Track C (Entry, Descent, and Landing), I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP for the proposals submitted by AS&M, ATK, Lockheed, Boeing, and ViGYAN. The CO determined that the procedures in accordance with NFS 1815. 305-71(a) apply as the number of proposals was no more than the number of awards contemplated for Track C. In accordance with NFS 1815. 305-71(a), the Contracting Officer reviewed the solicitation and determined that (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive, and (2) adequate price competition exists based on the receipt of multiple acceptable competitive proposals.

I concur with the findings of the SEB and CO. Specifically, in evaluating Factor 1 - Past Performance, I noted that four of the five Offerors received either a High or Moderate Level of Confidence rating, while one Offeror received a Low Level of Confidence rating. Also, the four Offerors with either a High or Moderate Level of Confidence rating had a range of pertinent to very highly pertinent experience. The Offeror with a Low Level of Confidence rating had only somewhat pertinent experience. All five Offerors had very effective or exemplary performance. Regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price, I noted that a detailed price analysis of the proposed rates was performed for each Offeror and determined to be reasonable, realistic and reflect a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that only one of the five Offerors received a weakness for its Small Business Utilization Response overall response which I find does not make its overall response to this Factor unacceptable. Therefore, all five Offerors satisfied the RFP requirements of small business subcontracting, or small business utilization, as appropriate to the Offeror's size status, in accordance with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements (applicable only to the three large businesses). For Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), I noted that the Plans submitted by the five Offerors are acceptable based on their demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and their proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

I noted that ViGYAN received a Low Level of Confidence Past Performance rating. I also noted that all Offerors, except ViGYAN demonstrated relevant experience in all three PWS sections; whereas ViGYAN demonstrated experience only in PWS section C.3, Analysis and Testing. In the one PWS section in which ViGYAN did demonstrate experience, it was rated Pertinent. Two Offerors, Boeing and AS&M were rated as Very Highly Pertinent and Highly Pertinent, respectively. Additionally, ViGYAN had an exemplary performance rating but, if selected, would not contribute any additional capabilities of value beyond those that can be obtained by Boeing and AS&M. Further, in the next most important Factor, Cost/Price, ViGYAN's evaluated average rate was appreciably higher than AS&M's rate. Finally, the evaluation of the Small Business Utilization Plan and Organizational Conflicts of Interest factor did not yield any significant advantage for ViGYAN versus the other Offerors. Based on these differences, I find that the Boeing and AS&M proposals were superior to ViGYAN's proposal.

For this Track, ViGYAN received the lowest pertinence rating and the lowest past performance confidence level rating of the Offerors. Given the depth of coverage demonstrated by the other four Offerors in the one PWS section in which ViGYAN demonstrated pertinent experience, I

determined that including VIGYAN in Track C would not provide access to experience which exists in as much or greater depth with the other Offerors. For the reasons stated above, I find that the selection of the ViGYAN proposal is not in the Government's best interest and does not provide the best value for the Government.

#### **Source Selection Decision – Track C**

Accordingly, I hereby select AS&M, ATK, Boeing, and Lockheed for award of Track C BAART contracts.

#### **TRACK D**

In making the selection decision for Track D (Measurement Systems and Autonomous Technologies), I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP for the proposals submitted by ATK, Boeing, NGAS, and ViGYAN. The CO determined that the procedures in accordance with NFS 1815.305-71(a) apply as the number of responsive proposals was no more than the number of awards contemplated for Track D. In accordance with NFS 1815.305-71(a), the Contracting Officer reviewed the solicitation and determined that (1) the solicitation was not flawed or unduly restrictive, and (2) adequate price competition exists based on the receipt of multiple acceptable 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 SEB findings and determined that all aforementioned proposals for Track D were acceptable. I concur with the findings of the SEB and CO. Specifically, in evaluating Factor 1 - Past Performance, the four proposals were determined to be acceptable based on three of the four Offerors receiving a Moderate Level of Confidence rating and one Offeror receiving a Low Level of Confidence rating; as a result of three Offerors with a range of pertinent to highly pertinent experience and one Offeror with somewhat pertinent experience; and all four Offerors with effective, very effective, or exemplary performance. Regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price, I noted that a detailed price analysis of the proposed rates was performed for each Offeror and determined to be reasonable, realistic and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that all four Offerors met the requirements of small business subcontracting, or small business utilization, as appropriate to the Offeror's size status, in accordance with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements (applicable only to the three large business Offerors), the subcontracting goals established for Track D of this procurement, and the commitment to the Small Business Program. For Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), I noted that the Plans submitted by the four Offerors are acceptable based on their demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and their proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

#### **Source Selection Decision – Track D**

As stated earlier for Track A, to ensure that Langley has the necessary flexibility to perform its work and to ensure that adequate technical capability is available for each PWS, it is necessary to select all four Offerors for award for Track D. Only by selecting all four Offerors can Langley ensure that there are at least two Offerors with experience in each PWS subsection available to compete for work under PWS Track D, which is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government.

Accordingly, I select ATK, Boeing, NGAS, and VIGYAN for award of Track D BAART contracts.

**TRACK E**

In making the selection decision for Track E (Flight-Critical and Intelligent Flight Systems), I considered the relative importance of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP for the proposals submitted by Aurora, Boeing, Engility, Honeywell, NGAS, Rockwell, and Saab.

After reviewing the SEB findings for Factor 1 – Past Performance, it was clear to me that the diversity of the technical experience demonstrated by these Offerors supported the criticality of ensuring sustainable technical coverage of each PWS section for Track E and accordingly necessitates that I select more than the number of awards contemplated for Track E. As stated earlier for Track A, the BAART contract can be used to support all NASA Centers that require work within the scope of the PWS for Track E, thus providing not only Langley, but also the Agency, the flexibility to accommodate current as well as potential future requirements. As Langley and Agency capability requirements increase, the BAART contract can provide the spectrum of desired contractor experience capabilities for inclusion in its technical portfolio to meet those needs.

Regarding the technical experience of the Offerors in PWS section E.1, Crew Systems and Aviation Operators (comprising of PWS subsections E.1.1 through E.1.3), PWS section E.2, Safety-Critical Aviation Systems (comprising of PWS subsections E.2.1 through E.2.3), and PWS section E.3, Flight-Critical Systems Analysis and Assessment, I noted that Engility, Boeing, and Saab demonstrated breadth of experience in all PWS sections. Though these Offerors demonstrated breadth of experience, only Honeywell demonstrated depth in all seven subsections. Engility and Saab demonstrated depth of experience in four and five subsections, respectively. Boeing, NGAS, and Rockwell demonstrated experience in the preponderance of the subsections, but did not demonstrate depth of experience in as many of the subsections. Aurora demonstrated breadth of experience in a few subsections and depth of experience in none. Of importance to me in considering my selection is retaining the capability for PWS section E.1, Crew Systems and Aviation Operations, of performing and moving current work forward as well as supporting upcoming research work such as avionics development and flight demonstrations. This type of research continues to be of increased interest at Langley and the Agency. I find it is critical to have at least two Offerors with demonstrated depth of experience (rated as VHP or HP) in each PWS E.1, E.2, and E.3 subsection.

Having at least two such Offerors in each of these subsections would provide not only the breadth, but significant depth of experience in PWS sections E.1 through E.3 to meet Langley and Agency requirements. In this way, the Agency will be better assured that it can obtain effective competition from highly experienced contractors. Having at least two such Offerors in each of these subsections would provide not only the breadth, but significant depth of experience to meet Langley and Agency requirements. In this way, the Agency will be better assured that it can obtain effective competition from highly experienced contractors for Flight-Critical Systems research work.

I also noted that in PWS section E.4, Flight Dynamics, Guidance, and Control (comprising of PWS subsection E.4.1 through E.4.3) and PWS section E.5, Autonomous and Intelligent Flight Technologies, the breadth of demonstrated experience in these subsections was not as comprehensive across all Offerors as in PWS sections E.1, E.2, and E.3. Though Aurora, Honeywell, NGAS, and Saab demonstrated breadth of experience in all PWS E.4 and E.5 subsections, none demonstrated depth of experience in all PWS E.4 and E.5 subsections. Aurora, Honeywell, and NGAS demonstrated depth of experience in the preponderance of the subsection, whereas Saab only demonstrated depth of experience in two subsections. Boeing

demonstrated experience in one subsection, but did not demonstrate depth. Engility demonstrated experience in three subsections, but did not demonstrate depth in any of these subsections. Rockwell did not demonstrate experience in any subsections. Of importance to me in considering my selection is the Agency's need for capability in PWS section E.5, Autonomous and Intelligent Flight Technologies. Autonomous technologies, capabilities, and systems is an emerging and important area not only within the Agency but across the aerospace industry. Additionally, research work continues to grow in unmanned aerial vehicles for scientific and commercial use and there will be an increased need for experienced, capable contractors to support such research. I find it is critical to have at least two Offerors with demonstrated depth of experience (rated as VHP or HP) in PWS sections E.4 and E.5. The lack of breadth and depth among some of the Offerors does not allow for a robust capability in these PWS subsections if only five Offerors are selected. Only the ability to access the combined demonstrated experience of all Offerors would provide significant depth of experience to Langley and the Agency in these two PWS sections. Therefore, in order to maximize the potential for effective competition in PWS sections E.4 and E.5, I determined it to be in the best interest of the Government to award contracts to all seven Offerors. Awarding to all seven Offerors would eliminate the gaps in breadth of experience identified in PWS sections E.4 and E.5 while retaining capabilities in the other Track E PWS sections in which Offerors did demonstrate experience.

Having multiple contractors with depth of experience in all PWS sections expands the Agency's access to expertise and resources to enhance the Agency's ability to meet expanding basic and applied research, technology development, systems analyses, and trade studies in airborne and ground-based systems critical to flight safety, management, and control. The only way to achieve this level across all Track E PWS sections is to make award to all seven Offerors. I determined that by including all of the Offerors for Track E the Agency would maximize access to the greatest breadth of experience as well as the greatest depth of experience. I therefore determined making award in this manner maximizes the likelihood of obtaining effective competition from highly experienced contractors, maximizes access to small businesses with depth of experience, and minimizes the technical risk to Agency programs and projects that will be supported by the BAART contractors.

Regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price, I noted that a detailed price analysis of the proposed rates was performed for each Offeror and determined to be reasonable, realistic and reflect a clear understanding of the requirements. For Factor 3 - Small Business Utilization, I noted that only one of the seven Offerors received a weakness for its Small Business Utilization Response, which I find does not make its response to this Factor unacceptable. Therefore, all seven Offerors met the requirements for small business subcontracting, or small business utilization, as appropriate to the Offeror's size status, in accordance with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements (applicable only to the six large business. For Factor 4 – Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI), I noted that only one of the Plans submitted contained a weakness, however, I find this weakness does not make its Plan unacceptable. Therefore, all Plans are considered acceptable based on their demonstrated understanding of the complexities of OCIs and their proposed solutions appropriate for different types of OCIs.

#### **Source Selection Decision – Track E**

In conclusion, selecting all seven Offerors in Track E assures each technical PWS section has potential competition between higher rated relevant Offerors. Additionally, having multiple contractors with the requisite capabilities in the emerging technology sections establishes a

much broader portfolio making Langley more capable of satisfying customers' needs and enhancing our ability to explore new areas of interest as Langley continues to seek out work in these emerging technology areas. Awarding a contract to all seven Offerors for Track E will realize such technical diversity, increase our ability to contract with small businesses where practicable, achieve potential cost savings from lower average rates offered by small businesses, which ultimately is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government.

Accordingly, I hereby select Aurora, Boeing, Engility, Honeywell, NGAS, Rockwell, and Saab for award of Track E BAART contracts.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jill M. Marlowe", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jill M. Marlowe  
Source Selection Authority