Source Selection Statement

Specialized Engineering, Aeronautics, and Manufacturing (SEAM) Contracts (Solicitation Number NNJ16567749R)

On October 6, 2016, I, along with other senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Johnson Space Center (JSC), met with members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Specialized Engineering, Aeronautics, and Manufacturing (SEAM) solicitation (NNJ16567749R).

BACKGROUND

This procurement is to provide competitive task-order contract instruments for serving the specialized engineering, aeronautics, and manufacturing needs of the Flight Operations Directorate (FOD) at NASA JSC. The SEAM contract is a multiple-award contract with Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) Firm-Fixed-Price and Time-and-Materials Task Orders.

The Statement of Work (SOW) is comprised of five (5) Task Categories. Task Categories A, B, and E are small-business set-asides in accordance with FAR 6.203; Task Categories C and D were competed under full and open competition. All resulting contracts will be awarded with the flexibility to have Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) or Time-and-Materials (T&M) Task Orders, with the exception of Task Category E which will only have FFP Task Orders. The Request for Proposal (RFP) was designed to allow Offeror(s) maximum flexibility in proposing one or more Task Categories of its choice. The Task Categories and associated Critical Capabilities consist of the following:

Task Category A: Aero Structural Engineering and Analysis

Aircraft and Aircraft Systems flight testing and support, specifically for:

1. Loads Determination
2. Detailed Stress Analysis
3. Detailed Dynamic Analysis
4. Fatigue Analysis
5. Random, Sine, And Shock Analysis
6. Aero-elastic Analysis
7. Damage Tolerance Assessment (DTA)

Computational Fluid Dynamics, specifically:

8. Flow Simulation, Visualization, and Loads

Testing, specifically:

9. Stress/Strain Testing of Mechanical or Electrical Systems/Components
10. Vibration Testing

Task Category B: Aero Mechanical Systems

1. System and component obsolescence
2. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft landing gear, tires, wheels, brakes, anti-skid
3. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft fuel systems
4. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft hydraulics
5. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft air conditioning and pressurization
6. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft pneumatics
7. Sustainment, alteration and improvement of aircraft flight controls
8. Loads determination
9. Detailed stress analysis
10. Damage tolerance assessment
11. Instructions for continued airworthiness

Task Category C: Aero Avionics, Electrical, and Software

1. Avionics Integration
2. Line Replaceable Unit (LRU) Design and Integration
3. Circuit Design
4. Wire Harness Design
5. Payload Electrical Interface Design
6. Software Design and Integration
7. System and Component Obsolescence
8. Instructions for Continued Airworthiness
9. Electrical Loads Analysis
10. Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) or Radio Frequency Interferences (RFI) Analysis
11. Troubleshooting Using Schematics and Diagnostic Equipment

Task Category D: Ground Support Engineering

1. Design Modeling and Drawing Creation Using CREO Parametric and AutoCAD Software
2. Engineering Analysis and Support for Mockup Center of Gravity, Center of Buoyancy, Net Buoyancy Loads Determination and Tip Over Analysis
3. Stress Analysis and Report Generation
4. Hydraulic and Electro-Hydraulic Systems Design and Integration for Motion Control Systems
5. Electrical Systems Design and Integration
6. Structural Design, Including Welded Structures
7. Mechanical System Design
8. Software Design and Integration
9. Lighting Systems Design, Test and Integration
10. Reverse Engineering
11. Manufacturing and Fabrication

Task Category E: Fabrication and Provisioning

1. Machining
2. Sheet Metal Work
3. Additive Manufacturing (such as ABS 3-D) Printing
4. Welding
5. Finishing
6. Soft Goods Production (Sewing)
7. Electrical and Electronics Fabrication and Assembly
8. General Fabrication and Assembly
9. Purchasing for Projects as Required

As a result of this RFP, a total of twenty (20) proposals from ten (10) Offerors were timely submitted in response to the solicitation (Task Category A – four (4) proposals, Task Category B – one (1) proposal, Task Category C – four (4) proposals, Task Category D – six (6) proposals, Task Category E – five (5) proposals). One (1) proposal was delivered late and determined not eligible for evaluation in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(c) (3). Company names and Task Categories proposed for timely submitted proposals are identified below.

	Task Categories				
	A* Aero Structural Engineering and Analysis	**B*** Aero Mechanical Systems	**C** Aero Avionics, Electrical, and Software	**D** Ground Support Engineering	**E*** Fabrication and Provisioning
American Systems Corporation			X	X	
ATA Engineering, Inc.	X				
Bastion Technologies, Inc.	X		X	X	X
Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc.	X	X	X		X
Flight Test and Mechanical Solutions, Inc.	X				
Greisen Aerospace, LLC				X	X
Oceaneering International, Inc.				X	
Rothe Enterprises, Inc.				X	X
Southern Research Institute			X		
ZIN Technologies, Inc.				X	X

* Small Business Set-aside

The period of performance of the contract is a five-year base period with no option periods. No phase-in period is planned. The contract has been assigned the North American Industry Classification System code 541712, Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Biotechnology). The guaranteed minimum per contractor is $20,000 for the life of the contract and the maximum not-to-exceed (NTE) for the sum of all Task Orders to be issued under the contract is $49.5 million for the five-year period of performance.

On September 24, 2015, a Request for Information and Draft Statement of Work were posted to the SEAM website, in order to identify potential sources and to determine the appropriate set-aside decision. Virtual Industry Day charts were presented by teleconference on October 7, 2015. Individual one-on-one teleconferences with potential Offerors were held October 7-8, 2015. The Pre-Proposal Conference Bulletin was posted March 1, 2016. The RFP NNJ16567749R was issued on February 29, 2016, with proposals due on March 31, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. Central Time. RFP Amendment 1 was posted on March 18, 2016 to update various sections of the RFP and respond to industry questions. RFP Amendments 2 and 3 were posted on March 24, 2016, to clarify "Other Past Performance Data" Instructions, update various sections of the RFP, and to respond to industry questions.

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

As the Source Selection Authority (SSA), I appointed the SLPT for this procurement on April 27, 2016. Timely submitted proposals received in response to this RFP were evaluated by the SLPT in accordance with the evaluation procedures set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3, the NASA FAR Supplement 1815.3 and Section M of the RFP. The SLPT based its evaluations on the material presented in the individual Offeror's proposal.

The RFP indicated that the SLPT would conduct an initial review of proposals in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. None of the timely submitted proposals were determined "Unacceptable".

Following the initial review, the RFP indicated that all remaining proposals would be evaluated against the following evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Past Performance
Factor 2: Price

Under the Past Performance factor, set forth under Section M.2.1 of the RFP, the SLPT evaluated recency, relevance, and performance. Past performance was evaluated and rated using a confidence rating as defined in the NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305(a)(2)(A): Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.

To ensure that the pricing proposed by the Offeror was fair and reasonable, in accordance with Section M.2.2 of the RFP, the Government performed price analysis of all proposals timely received. Additionally, in accordance with FAR 15.305 and FAR 15.404, the SLPT also assessed the realism of each Offeror's proposed prices – including comparing the rates proposed with historical rates for the same or similar items purchased by the Government – in order to determine whether pricing was unrealistically low and evidenced a lack of understanding of the Government's requirements.

Section M.2.0 of the RFP states that "Past Performance is significantly more important than Price."

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals evaluated were determined to be acceptable and subsequently evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15, NFS Part 1815, and criteria stated in the RFP. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to the SSA at a Competitive Range meeting on August 4, 2016. The results as presented at the Competitive Range meeting are summarized below.

TASK CATEGORY A – AERO STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING AND ANALYSIS

ATA Engineering, Inc. (ATA)
Under the Past Performance Factor, the proposal received a Very High level of confidence. ATA's experience was evaluated as very relevant in nine (9) of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities and relevant for one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ATA's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.
Under the Price Factor, ATA's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Bastion Technologies, Inc. (Bastion)
Under the Past Performance Factor, Bastion received a Low level of confidence. Bastion's experience was evaluated as relevant in three (3) of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities; somewhat relevant in four (4); and it lacked experience in three (3). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Bastion's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Bastion's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc. (ES3)
Under the Past Performance Factor, ES3 received a Moderate level of confidence. ES3's experience was evaluated as very relevant in seven (7) of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities; and it lacked experience in three (3). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ES3's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, ES3's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Flight Test and Mechanical Solutions, Inc. (FMS)
Under the Past Performance Factor, the proposal received a High level of confidence. FMS' experience was evaluated as very relevant in seven (7) of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities; FMS' major subcontractor's experience was evaluated as relevant in two (2). Neither FMS, nor its major subcontractor demonstrated experience in one (1) Critical Capability. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. FMS's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, FMS's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

TASK CATEGORY B – AERO MECHANICAL SYSTEMS

ES3

Under the Past Performance Factor, ES3 received a Very High level of confidence. ES3's experience was evaluated as very relevant in nine (9) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; relevant in one (1); and somewhat relevant in one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ES3's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, ES3's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

TASK CATEGORY C – AERO AVIONICS, ELECTRICAL, AND SOFTWARE

American Systems Corporation (American Systems)

Under the Past Performance Factor, American Systems received a Very High level of confidence. American Systems' experience was evaluated as very relevant in six (6) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; American Systems' major subcontractor was evaluated as very relevant in the remaining five (5). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. American Systems' performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, American Systems' price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Bastion

Under the Past Performance Factor, Bastion received a Moderate level of confidence. Bastion's major subcontractor demonstrated very relevant experience in six (6) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities. Neither Bastion, nor its major subcontractor demonstrated experience in five (5). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Bastion's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, Bastion's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

ES3

Under the Past Performance Factor, ES3 received a Moderate level of confidence. ES3's experience was evaluated as very relevant in three (3) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; relevant in five (5); somewhat relevant in two (2); and it lacked experience in one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ES3's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, ES3's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

SRI

Under the Past Performance Factor, SRI received a High level of confidence. SRI's experience was evaluated as very relevant in two (2) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; relevant in four (4); and somewhat relevant in two (2). SRI's major subcontractor's experience was evaluated as very relevant in three (3) Critical Capabilities. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. SRI's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, SRI's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

TASK CATEGORY D – GROUND SUPPORT ENGINEERING SERVICES

American Systems

Under the Past Performance Factor, American Systems received a Moderate level of confidence. American Systems' experience was evaluated as very relevant in one (1) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; relevant in one (1); and somewhat relevant in two (2). American Systems' major subcontractors' experiences were evaluated as very relevant in two (2); relevant in four (4); and somewhat relevant in one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. American Systems' performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, American Systems' price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Bastion

Under the Past Performance Factor, Bastion received a High level of confidence. Bastion's experience was evaluated as very relevant in five (5) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities and somewhat relevant in one (1). Bastion's major subcontractor was evaluated very relevant in three (3) and relevant in two (2). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Bastion's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Bastion's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Greisen Aerospace, LLC (Greisen)

Under the Past Performance Factor, Greisen received a Neutral. Greisen lacked experience in all of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities.

Under the Price Factor, Greisen's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Oceaneering International, Inc. (Oceaneering)

Under the Past Performance Factor, Oceaneering received a Very High level of confidence. Oceaneering's experience was evaluated as very relevant in eight (8) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities and relevant in three (3). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Oceaneering's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Oceaneering's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Rothe Enterprises, Inc. (Rothe)

Under the Past Performance Factor, Rothe received a Moderate level of confidence. Rothe's experience was evaluated as very relevant in three (3) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities; relevant in one (1); and somewhat relevant in one (1). Rothe's major subcontractors' experiences were evaluated as very relevant in two (2); relevant in three (3); and somewhat relevant in one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Rothe's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Rothe's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

ZIN Technologies, Inc. (ZIN)

Under the Past Performance Factor, ZIN received a High level of confidence. ZIN's experience was evaluated as very relevant in three (3) of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities. ZIN's major subcontractor's experience was evaluated very relevant in four (4) and relevant in four (4) of the Critical Capabilities. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ZIN's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, ZIN's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

TASK CATEGORY E– FABRICATION AND PROVISIONING

Bastion

Under the Past Performance Factor, Bastion received a Very High level of confidence. Bastion's experience was evaluated as very relevant in seven (7) of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities and relevant in one (1). Bastion's major subcontractor's experience was evaluated very relevant in one (1) Critical Capability. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Bastion's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Bastion's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

ES3

Under the Past Performance Factor, ES3 received a Moderate level of confidence. ES3's experience was evaluated as relevant in six (6) of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities; somewhat relevant in two (2); and it lacked experience in one (1). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ES3's performance rating was assessed as Very Good overall.

Under the Price Factor, ES3's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Greisen

Under the Past Performance Factor, Greisen received a Neutral. Greisen lacked experience in all of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities.

Under the Price Factor, Greisen's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

Rothe

Under the Past Performance Factor, Rothe received a High level of confidence. Rothe's experience was evaluated as very relevant in three (3) of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities and relevant in six (6). All referenced contracts were found to be recent. Rothe's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, Rothe's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

ZIN

Under the Past Performance Factor, ZIN received a Very High level of confidence. ZIN's experience was evaluated as very relevant in four (4) of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities and relevant in one (1). ZIN's major subcontractor's experience was evaluated very relevant in four (4) Critical Capabilities. All referenced contracts were found to be recent. ZIN's performance rating was assessed as Excellent overall.

Under the Price Factor, ZIN's price was determined to be Reasonable and Realistic.

COMPETITVE RANGE DETERMINATION

Based on the findings from the SLPT, it was determined that award on the initial proposals was not appropriate, and a competitive range of the most highly rated proposals was established in accordance with FAR 15.306(c).

The most highly rated proposals in each Task Category included the following:

	Task Categories				
	A* Aero Structural Engineering and Analysis	**B*** Aero Mechanical Systems	**C** Aero Avionics, Electrical, and Software	**D** Ground Support Engineering	**E*** Fabrication and Provisioning
American Systems Corporation			X		
ATA Engineering, Inc.	X				
Bastion Technologies, Inc.				X	X
Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc.		X	X		
Flight Test and Mechanical Solutions, Inc.	X				
Oceaneering International, Inc.				X	
Rothe Enterprises, Inc.					X
Southern Research Institute			X		
ZIN Technologies, Inc.				X	X

* Small Business Set-aside

On August 4, 2016 I concurred with the Contracting Officer's determination, and I authorized the SLPT to proceed with discussions with the Offerors remaining in the competitive range, leading to submittal and evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs).

DISCUSSIONS AND FINAL PROPOSAL REVISIONS

Each of the most highly rated Offerors was informed of its inclusion in the competitive range by a letter dated August 9, 2016. This letter included written discussion questions and requested responses by August 22, 2016. Discussions were closed and FPRs were timely received by September 12, 2016. Clarifications were held to afford Offerors the opportunity to resolve minor or clerical errors in their FPR. Written responses to clarification items were due by October 3, 2016.

After receipt of the written discussion responses and FPRs, the SLPT updated the price evaluation. No discussion questions required changes to past performance and no Offerors submitted revised past performance.

EVALUATION OF FPR AND PRESENTATION OF FINAL FINDINGS

On October 6, 2016, a briefing of the SLPT's findings and evaluation was made to me in my capacity as the SSA. Prior to the briefing, I was provided with a full set of findings to review, which I did review before making my selection. The SLPT Voting Members, SLPT Committee Members, SLPT Ex-Officio Members, and key management officials also attended the briefing. During the briefing, the overall evaluation process and findings on Past Performance and Price were presented and discussed. Additionally, during the briefing, I provided the SLPT with my independent judgment relative to the findings and asked questions regarding the information presented. After each Task Category was presented, I informed the attendees of my decision and my reasons for selection. This selection decision results from the briefing and my review of the full set of findings. I noted that the board evaluated the FPRs and that none of the Past Performance ratings or Price reasonableness or realism determinations changed as a result of discussions.

The following is a summary of the final evaluation of all Offerors in competitive range:

	Past Performance	Relative Price Ranking*
Task Category A		
ATA Engineering	Very High	Highest
FMS	High	Lowest
Task Category B		
ES3	Very High	Not Applicable
Task Category C		
American Systems	Very High	Lowest
SRI	High	Highest
ES3	Moderate	Middle
Task Category D		
Oceaneering	Very High	Highest
ZIN	High	Lowest
Bastion	High	Middle
Task Category E		
ZIN	Very High	Lowest
Bastion	Very High	Highest
Rothe	High	Middle

* In comparison to the other Offerors in the competitive range for the subject Task Category.

The SLPT presented and discussed with me its evaluation findings for each Offeror in each Task Category on a category-by-category basis, namely, the results of each Offeror's Past Performance evaluation and Price evaluation. During the October 6, 2016 presentation to me, I also questioned the SLPT as to the type of experience each Offeror offered under each Task Category with respect to the applicable Critical Capabilities under each Task Category. I also inquired as to the degree to which this Past Performance provided an indicator of how well each Offeror would be expected to perform a given Task Category.

Based on the information presented, I fully understand the evaluation process, the SLPT findings, and concur with the overall SLPT evaluation and findings. I am in agreement with the information presented by the SLPT and take no exception to the actions or findings of the SLPT. I understand, with regard to the two evaluation factors, that Past Performance is significantly more important than Price pursuant to section M.2.0 of the RFP. I also understand that award should be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose proposal meets the requirements of the RFP and provides the "best value" to the Government in each Task Category. Finally, in making the selections, I considered the fact that awarding multiple contracts in a Task Category will benefit NASA JSC on two fronts. First awarding multiple contracts in a Task Category enhances competition of the task orders to be issued under SEAM, and in doing so, helps to ensure that NASA JSC receives the best value for each task order it issues. Second, awarding multiple contracts in a Task Category expands the breadth and depth of expertise available to NASA JSC under SEAM and enables NASA JSC to benefit from the diverse capabilities of those Offerors that submitted strong proposals – thereby enhancing and diversifying NASA JSC's capabilities.

Task Category A – Aero Structural Engineering and Analysis

I reviewed the results of the SLPT's evaluation of the two (2) Offerors that remained in the competitive range with regard to Task Category A (ATA and FMS). I inquired further into the SLPT's basis for its evaluation conclusions and associated ratings for both of these Offerors concerning the Past Performance and Price evaluation factors.

ATA

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of ATA under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of ATA's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities for Task Category A. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of ATA's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that ATA provided very relevant experience on aero structural engineering and analysis tasks related to aircraft which are the same or similar to the FOD fleet in nine (9) out of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities. For the remaining Critical Capability, ATA demonstrated relevant experience. The SLPT also assessed the quality of ATA's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that ATA's performance was predominantly excellent and warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of ATA's performance, the SLPT determined that ATA's performance was of exceptional merit and was very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition.

Thus, the SLPT assigned ATA a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning ES3 an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of ATA's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its fully burdened labor rates (FBRs) were realistic. The SLPT explained that ATA's final proposed price and FBRs were within proximity to the IGCE and its rates were in line with historical FBRs for similar contracts. I noted that ATA's total price was slightly higher than the price proposed by the other Offeror in the competitive range. The SLPT also explained that ATA's price was received in an environment with adequate competition to establish the reasonableness of its price. After a review of ATA's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that ATA's price was both reasonable and realistic.

FMS

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of FMS under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of FMS' recent and relevant past performance experience (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities for Task Category A. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of FMS' recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that FMS provided very relevant experience on aero structural engineering and analysis tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in seven (7) out of the ten (10) Critical Capabilities. For two of the remaining Critical Capabilities, FMS' major subcontractor, had demonstrated relevant experience in those areas. However, I did note that neither FMS, nor its major subcontractor, had any demonstrated experience pertaining to one (1) Critical Capability. I asked the SLPT to elaborate on this lack of relevant performance concerning this area. The SLPT explained that it had considered this to be a relatively minor issue due to the fact that the Critical Capability represented a fairly insubstantial component of the entire scope of work for Task Category A. Notwithstanding this issue, the SLPT remained confident in FMS' ability to successfully compete for task orders under Task Category A and its ability to perform the SEAM requirements. The SLPT also assessed the quality of FMS' performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that FMS' performance (including that of its major subcontractor) was consistently excellent across all contract references and warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of FMS' performance, the SLPT determined that FMS' performance was overall highly pertinent to a vast majority of the SEAM acquisition requirements areas and that it demonstrated very effective performance that would be fully responsive to those requirements, notwithstanding FMS' lack of experience performing tasks concerning one (1) Critical Capability, and that FMS warranted a High overall level of confidence rating for its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning FMS an overall confidence rating of High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of FMS' price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that FMS' final proposed price and FBRs were within proximity to the IGCE. The SLPT also explained that FMS' price was received in an environment with adequate competition to establish the reasonableness of its price and that FMS' proposed price was comparable to the prices proposed by other Offerors. I also noted that FMS' total price was slightly lower than the price proposed by the other Offeror in the competitive range. After

a review of FMS' pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that FMS' price was both reasonable and realistic. I understood the SLPT's rationale for its conclusions and concurred with them.

Selection Decision – Task Category A

I note that the SEAM RFP (Section L.15.1) stated that SEAM is a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract and that NASA anticipates award of multiple contracts under each task category. As such, after an integrated assessment of the Offerors remaining in the competitive range for Task Category A, I must consider whether to make awards to multiple Offerors or select a single awardee.

First, with regard to ATA, I found that ATA's highest possible overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of exemplary performance for recent work that was very relevant across all of the enumerated Critical Capabilities, is value-added and is worth the slight price premium. Moreover, ATA will be part of the competitive environment in future task orders for this Task Category. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and findings for ATA, I determine that ATA's proposal offers the best value to the Government.

I considered it extremely important for NASA to have multiple providers to maximize the probability that NASA will receive quality aero structural engineering and analysis services for the FOD fleet in a competitive environment that will result in reduced risk to the Agency and the most cost-effective work for the Government in downstream task orders. In doing so, I considered award of a contract to FMS, another Offeror within the competitive range.

I found that FMS' high overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of excellent performance for recent work that was, in the vast majority of cases, relevant or very relevant to the Critical Capabilities enumerated , offered at a slightly lower price than that offered by ATA, also represented the best value to the Agency. Having both ATA and FMS as contract holders for Task Category A will ensure that NASA has a deep bench of qualified contractors to provide structural engineering and analysis tasks in an environment that will engender price competition on such task orders. Thus, I conclude that award to both ATA and FMS is the optimal decision for Task Category A.

In accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that both companies provide the best value to the Government in the Aero Structural Engineering and Analysis Task Category. Accordingly, I hereby select ATA Engineering, Inc. and Flight Test and Mechanical Solutions, Inc. for award of SEAM contracts in Task Category A.

Task Category B – Aero Mechanical Systems

I noted that only one (1) proposal was received for Task Category B and that the SLPT evaluated this proposal in accordance with the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS). In this case, the sole proposal was submitted by ES3, despite the SLPT's expectation that more than one Offeror would propose for this Task Category. Based upon the SLPT's initial evaluation of ES3, I concurred with the contracting officer's recommendation to consider ES3 the sole offeror within the competitive range and to conduct discussions with ES3.

ES3

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of ES3's proposal under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of ES3's recent and relevant experience (and the quality of performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category B. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of ES3's experience across all of these Critical Capabilities, including the task size, content, and complexity of such previous work, in determining relevancy. I noted that ES3 provided very relevant and recent experience across all but two of the Critical Capabilities. ES3 had demonstrated to the SLPT that it had relevant and recent experience for one (1) and somewhat relevant experience one (1) Critical Capability. Per the RFP, tasks performed for similar aircraft as the NASA FOD fleet listed in the Statement of Work (SOW) would be considered more relevant than tasks on dissimilar aircraft. As such, I note that a vast majority of ES3's aero mechanical systems experience has been on aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet. The SLPT also assessed the quality of ES3's performance on its relevant contracts and determined, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that ES3's performance rating was Excellent. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of ES3's performance, the SLPT determined that ES3's performance was of exceptional merit and was very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned ES3 a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning ES3 an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of ES3's proposed price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that ES3's final proposed price, received in its final proposal revision, was received in an environment that was anticipated to be competitive and that the SLPT expected competitors for this effort. The SLPT explained that ES3's proposed price was within close proximity to the IGCE for this Task Category. After a review of ES3's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that ES3's price was both reasonable and realistic. I understood the SLPT's rationale for its conclusions and concurred with them.

Selection Decision – Task Category B

Based upon the merit of ES3's demonstrated experience in the vast majority of Critical Capabilities and its documented exemplary record of recent past performance (and because Past Performance is significantly more important than price), coupled with ES3's fair and reasonable and realistic price, I find ES3's proposal represents the best value to the Government with respect to Task Category B, notwithstanding the fact that ES3 was the only Offeror to propose on this Task Category. I find the depth of ES3's experience across all of the Critical Capability areas to be of value to the Government and that ES3's price is worth that added value.

In accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that ES3 provides the best value to the Government in the Aero Mechanical Systems Task Category, and I hereby select Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc. for award of the SEAM contract in Task Category B.

Task Category C – Aero Avionics, Electrical, and Software

I reviewed the results of the SLPT's evaluation of the three (3) Offerors that remained in the competitive range with regard to Task Category C (American Systems, ES3, and SRI). I inquired further into the SLPT's basis for its evaluation conclusions and associated ratings for all these Offerors concerning the Past Performance and Price evaluation factors.

American Systems

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of American Systems under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of American Systems' recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category C. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of American Systems' recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that American Systems provided very relevant experience on aero avionics, electrical and software tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in six (6) of the Critical Capabilities, and its major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in the remaining five (5) Critical Capabilities. When coupled with its proposed major subcontractor, American Systems' proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant experience in all eleven Critical Capabilities. The SLPT also assessed the quality of American Systems' performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that American Systems' performance was predominantly excellent, but taking into account a good safety assessment based on the available information, it warranted an overall Very Good rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of American Systems' performance, the SLPT determined that American Systems' performance was of exceptional merit and was very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned American Systems a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning American Systems an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of American Systems' price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that American Systems' final proposed price and FBRs, although higher than the IGCE, were comparable to the average proposed price and average proposed FBRs of the other Offerors in Competitive Range. In addition, the rates are comparable to its actual historical FBRs on another existing American Systems' contract. After a review of American Systems' pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that American Systems' price was both reasonable and realistic. I understood the SLPT's rationale for its conclusions and concurred with them.

SRI

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of SRI under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of SRI's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category C. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of SRI's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that SRI provided very relevant experience on aero avionics, electrical and software tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in

two (2) Critical Capabilities; relevant experience in four (4) Critical Capabilities; and somewhat relevant experience in two (2) Critical Capabilities. Its major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in three (3) Critical Capabilities. Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant, relevant, or somewhat relevant experience in all eleven (11) Critical Capabilities. The SLPT concluded that after consideration of both SRI's and its major subcontractor's experience across all Critical Capabilities for Task Category C, SRI is capable of performing the SOW of the contract. Specifically, I did note that of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities, SRI demonstrated varying levels of experience in eight (8), and the RFP specifically stated that past performance of the Prime will weigh more heavily than any subcontractor in the overall past performance rating. The SLPT also assessed the quality of SRI's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that SRI's performance was excellent, but taking into account a low safety assessment due to lower than industry average Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) rates, it warranted an overall Very Good rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of SRI's performance, the SLPT determined that SRI's performance was very effective and highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned SRI a High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning SRI an overall confidence rating of High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of SRI's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that SRI's final proposed price, although the highest of all Offerors in the Competitive Range, was comparable to the average proposed price of all Offerors in the Competitive Range and within a reasonable range of the IGCE (although somewhat higher). The FBRs were determined realistic based on SRI's average fully burdened rates being comparable to those proposed by the Offerors in the Competitive Range, and to its fully burdened rates on a similar. After a review of SRI's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that SRI's price was both reasonable and realistic. I understood the SLPT's rationale for its conclusions and concurred with them.

ES3

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of ES3 under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of ES3's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category C. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of ES3's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that ES3 provided very relevant experience on aero avionics, electrical and software tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in three (3) Critical Capabilities; relevant experience in four (4) Critical Capabilities; and somewhat relevant experience in two (2) Critical Capabilities. However, I did note that ES3 did not demonstrate experience pertaining to one (1) of the Critical Capabilities. I asked the SLPT to elaborate on this lack of relevant performance concerning this area. The SLPT explained that it had considered this to be a relatively minor issue due to the fact that each task order would involve a subset of critical capabilities. The SLPT informed me that lack of experience in one critical capability did not substantially diminish the SLPT's overall confidence in ES3's ability to perform the work under this task category.. Despite the lack of experience in this Critical Capability, I find value in the fact that ES3's experience was all resident, as the RFP indicated that greater weight would be given to a Prime Offeror in assessing overall Past Performance. The SLPT also assessed the quality of ES3's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available Past Performance data reviewed, that ES2's performance was

Very Good to Excellent, but taking into account an adequate safety assessment, it warranted an overall Very Good rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of ES3's performance, the SLPT determined that ES3's performance is pertinent to the SEAM acquisition and that it had demonstrated effective performance. Thus, the SLPT assigned ES3 a Moderate overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning ES3 an overall confidence rating of Moderate. When I inquired with the SLPT as to their reasoning for their overall Moderate confidence rating, they explained that but for ES3's lack of performance in the remaining Critical Capability, ES3 would have been assessed at a higher confidence level. However, the SLPT further explained that it considered ES3 at the high end of the Moderate confidence rating spectrum. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of ES3's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that ES3's final proposed price and FBRs, although higher than the IGCE, they were comparable to the average proposed price and average proposed FBRs of the other Offerors in Competitive Range. In addition, the rates are comparable to its actual historical provisional billing rates. After a review of ES3's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that ES3's price was both reasonable and realistic. I understood the SLPT's rationale for its conclusions and concurred with them.

Selection Decision – Task Category C

I note that the SEAM RFP (Section L.15.1) stated that SEAM is a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract and that NASA anticipates award of multiple contracts under each Task Category. As such, after an integrated assessment of the Offerors remaining in the competitive range for Task Category C, I must consider whether to make awards to multiple Offerors or select a single awardee.

First, with regard to American Systems, I found that its proposal received the highest possible overall confidence rating (Very High), based upon the depth and breadth of exemplary performance for recent work that was very relevant across all of the enumerated Critical Capabilities by American Systems and its major subcontractor is value-added, offered the lowest price of the Offerors in Competitive Range, and therefore represents the best value to the Government. Moreover, award to American Systems means that it will be part of the competitive environment in future task orders for this Task Category. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and findings for American Systems, I determine that American Systems' demonstrated experience at the lowest price offered represents the best value to the Government.

I consider it extremely important for NASA to have multiple providers with aero avionics, electrical, and software experience to maximize the probability that NASA will receive quality support for the FOD fleet in a competitive environment that will result in reduced risk to the Agency and the most cost-effective work for the Government in downstream task orders. In doing so, I considered award of contracts to both ES3 and SRI, the other Offerors within the Competitive Range.

I found that SRI's proposal received a high overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of highly pertinent and very effective performance (both by SRI and its major subcontractor) for recent work that ranged from very relevant, relevant, to somewhat relevant to the Critical Capabilities for this Task Category. Notwithstanding the fact that SRI's proposed price is the highest of the offerors within the Competitive Range, it offered a higher price than that offered by American Systems and ES3, I find value in the fact that the vast majority of the experience was that of SRI, and where SRI lacked experience, its

major subcontractor possessed very relevant experience. Finally, award of a contract to SRI will be part of the competitive environment in downstream task orders, ensuring that NASA's individualized needs are met in the most cost-effective way possible. The SRI team's proposal demonstrates experience across all Critical Capabilities for this Task Category, when weighed against its proposed price, represents a best value to the Government.

I found that ES3, although it was assessed as having a lower overall past performance rating, also provides the best value for the Government. Notably, I took into account the SLPT's explanation that ES3's Moderate confidence rating was on the relative higher range of Moderate confidence rating spectrum. Also, it was significant to me that much of ES3's experience was for resident capabilities, which, in accordance with the RFP is more valuable than subcontracted experience. Where it lacked experience in avionics integration, I was satisfied with the SLPT's explanation that ES3's lack of experience would not cause ES3 to be less competitive on task orders for which it does have experience. Finally, I noted that of the three Offerors in Competitive Range, ES3 was the only one with an adequate safety assessment. All these facts increased my confidence in ES3's capability to perform the SOW and be competitive (and therefore enlarge the field of competition) in future task order competitions. When weighing the evaluated performance of ES3 against its price, which is marginally more expensive than the lowest price Offeror within the Competitive Range, I conclude that ES3's demonstrated experience, when weighed against the price proposed, represents a best value for the Government.

Having American Systems, ES3, and SRI as contract holders for Task Category C will ensure that NASA has a deep bench of qualified contractors to provide support in an environment that will engender price competition on such task orders. Thus, I conclude that award to these Offerors is the optimal decision for Task Category C.

In accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that all three (3) companies provide the best value to the Government in the Aero, Avionics, Electrical and Software Task Category, and I hereby select American Systems Corporation, Southern Research Institute, and Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc. for award of the SEAM contract in Task Category C.

Task Category D – Ground Support Engineering Services

I reviewed the results of the SLPT's evaluation of the three (3) Offerors that remained in the competitive range with regard to Task Category D (Bastion, Oceaneering, and ZIN). I inquired further into the SLPT's basis for its evaluation conclusions and associated ratings for all these Offerors concerning the Past Performance and Price evaluation factors.

Bastion

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of Bastion under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of Bastion's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category D. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of Bastion's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that Bastion provided very relevant experience on ground support engineering services tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in six (6) Critical Capabilities ; and somewhat relevant experience in one (1). Its

major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in two (2) Critical Capabilities; and relevant experience in two (2) Critical Capabilities. Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant, relevant, or somewhat relevant experience in all eleven (11) Critical Capabilities, and its somewhat relevant experience was only for only one Critical Capability. The SLPT also assessed the quality of Bastion's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that Bastion's performance was excellent, but taking into account an excellent safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of Bastion's performance, the SLPT determined that Bastion's performance was highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition and demonstrated very effective performance. Thus, the SLPT assigned Bastion a High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning Bastion an overall confidence rating of High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of Bastion's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that Bastion's final proposed price and FBRs were higher than the IGCE, but comparable to the average price and FBRs proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range. Additionally, Bastion's FBR's were comparable to its FBRs on an existing contract. After a review of Bastion's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that Bastion's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

Oceaneering

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of Oceaneering under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of Oceaneering's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category D. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of Oceaneering's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that Oceaneering provided very relevant experience on ground support engineering services tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in all but three (3) Critical Capabilities. For three (3), Oceaneering provided relevant experience. Oceaneering, therefore demonstrated resident very relevant and relevant experience in all eleven (11) Critical Capabilities. The SLPT also assessed the quality of Oceaneering's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that Oceaneering's performance was excellent, and taking into account an excellent safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of Oceaneering's performance, the SLPT determined that Oceaneering's performance was of exceptional merit and very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned Oceaneering a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning Oceaneering an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of Oceaneering's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that Oceaneering's final proposed price and FBRs were higher than the IGCE, but comparable to the average price and FBRs proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range. I noted that Oceaneering's total price was the highest of all the Offerors in Competitive Range. After a review of Oceaneering's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that Oceaneering's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

ZIN

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of ZIN under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of ZIN's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the eleven (11) Critical Capabilities for Task Category D. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of ZIN's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that ZIN provided very relevant experience on ground support engineering services tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in four (4) Critical Capabilities; and relevant experience in four (4). ZIN's subcontractor provided very relevant experience in three (3) Critical Capabilities. Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant and relevant experience in all eleven (11) Critical Capabilities. The SLPT also assessed the quality of ZIN's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that ZIN's performance was predominately excellent, and taking into account a very good safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of ZIN's performance, the SLPT determined that ZIN's performance was very effective and was highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned ZIN a High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning ZIN an overall confidence rating of High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of ZIN's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that ZIN's final proposed price and FBRs were lower than the average price and FBRs proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range, but comparable to the IGCE. I noted that ZIN's total price was the lowest of all the Offerors in Competitive Range. The SLPT further explained that ZIN's rates were lower because the rates in the location where they would perform the contract are lower. After a review of ZIN's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that ZIN's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

Selection Decision – Task Category D

I note that the SEAM RFP (Section L.15.1) stated that SEAM is a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract and that NASA anticipates award of multiple contracts under each Task Category. As such, after an integrated assessment of the Offerors remaining in the Competitive Range for Task Category D, I must consider whether to make awards to multiple Offerors or select a single awardee.

First, with regard to Oceaneering, I found that its proposal received the highest possible overall confidence rating of Very High, based upon the depth and breadth of exemplary performance for recent work that was very relevant across the majority of the enumerated Critical Capabilities is value-added. It was significant to me that the totality of Oceaneering's experience across the Critical Capabilities for this Task Categories is resident experience. Although Oceaneering has the highest price of the Offerors in the Competitive Range, I determined that its level of experience, and the fact that it has such broad and pertinent resident capability justifies the price premium. Moreover, Oceaneering will be part of the competitive environment in future task orders for this Task Category. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and

findings for Oceaneering, I determine that Oceaneering's proposal offers the best value to the Government.

I consider it extremely important for NASA to have multiple providers with ground support engineering services experience to maximize the probability that NASA will receive quality ground support engineering services for the FOD fleet in a competitive environment that will result in reduced risk to the Agency and the most cost-effective work for the Government in downstream task orders. In doing so, I considered award of a contract to Bastion and ZIN, the other Offerors within the Competitive Range.

I found that ZIN's proposal received a High overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of excellent performance for recent work that ranged from very relevant to relevant to the Critical Capabilities enumerated, by ZIN and its major subcontractor is value-added. I noted that ZIN possessed very relevant experience in some Critical Capabilities where the other Offeror's only had relevant experience which will maximize competition on task orders. ZIN's offered price was the lowest of all Offerors in the Competitive Range. Finally, award to ZIN will help maximize price competition in future task orders. Therefore, I find that ZIN's demonstrated past performance, when weighed against its proposed price, also represents the best value to the Agency.

I also found that Bastion's proposal received a High overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of excellent performance for recent work that ranged from very relevant, relevant, to somewhat relevant to the Critical Capabilities enumerated, by Bastion and its major subcontractor is value-added. I noted that Bastion possessed very relevant experience in some Critical Capabilities where the other Offerors only had relevant experience which will help ensure that NASA's needs are met and will maximize competition among contract holders on task orders. Bastion's offered price was lower than Oceaneering and higher than ZIN. Finally, award to Bastion will help maximize price competition in future task orders. Therefore, I find that Bastion's demonstrated past performance, when weighed against its proposed price, also represents the best value to the Agency.

Having Bastion, Oceaneering, and ZIN as contract holders for Task Category D will ensure that NASA has a deep bench of qualified contractors to provide support in an environment that will engender price competition on such task orders. Thus, I conclude that award to all three is the optimal decision for Task Category D.

In accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that all three companies provide the best value to the Government in the Ground Support Engineering Services Task Category, and I hereby select Bastion Technologies, Inc, Oceaneering International, Inc., and ZIN Technologies, Inc. for award of the SEAM contract in Task Category D.

Task Category E– Fabrication and Provisioning

I reviewed the results of the SLPT's evaluation of the three (3) Offerors that remained in the competitive range with regard to Task Category E (Bastion, Rothe, and ZIN) I inquired further into the SLPT's basis for its evaluation conclusions and associated ratings for all these Offerors concerning the Past Performance and Price evaluation factors.

Bastion

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of Bastion under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of Bastion's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities for Task Category E. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of Bastion's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that Bastion provided very relevant resident experience on fabrication and provisioning tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in seven (7) Critical Capabilities; and relevant resident experience in one (1). Its major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in one (1) Critical Capability. Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant or relevant experience in all nine (9) Critical Capabilities. The SLPT also assessed the quality of Bastion's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that Bastion's performance was excellent, and taking into account an excellent safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of Bastion's performance, the SLPT determined that Bastion's performance was of exceptional merit and very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned Bastion a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning Bastion an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of Bastion's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that Bastion's final proposed price and FBRs were somewhat higher than the IGCE, but comparable to the average price proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range and its FBRs on an existing engineering services contract. I noted that Bastion's total price was the highest of all the Offerors in the Competitive Range, but not significantly higher than the remaining pool of Offerors. After a review of Bastion's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that Bastion's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

Rothe

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of Rothe under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of Rothe's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities for Task Category E. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of Rothe's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that Rothe provided very relevant experience on fabrication and provisioning tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in one (1) Critical Capability; and relevant experience in one (1). One of its major subcontractors provided relevant experience in three (3) Critical Capabilities; its other major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in two (2) Critical Capabilities; and relevant experience in two (2). Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant or relevant experience in all nine (9) Critical Capabilities either by Rothe or one of its major subcontractors. The SLPT also assessed the quality of Rothe's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that Rothe's performance was very good to excellent, and taking into account a very good safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of Rothe's performance, the SLPT determined that Rothe's performance was highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition and highly effective. Thus, the SLPT assigned Rothe a High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I

understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning Rothe an overall confidence rating of High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of Rothe's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that although Rothe's average FBRs were higher than its historical rates on an existing contract, Rothe's final proposed price and FBRs were comparable to the average price and FBRs proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range and to the IGCE. I noted that Rothe's total price was lower than Bastion and higher than ZIN. After a review of Rothe's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that Rothe's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

ZIN

With regard to the SLPT's evaluation of ZIN under the Past Performance evaluation factor, I endeavored to understand the SLPT's assessment of ZIN's recent and relevant past performance (and the quality of that performance) for performing tasks concerning each of the nine (9) Critical Capabilities for Task Category E. Specifically, I reviewed the SLPT's assessment of the relevancy of ZIN's recent experience across all of these Critical Capabilities and I noted that ZIN provided very relevant experience on ground support engineering services tasks related to aircraft that were the same or similar to the FOD fleet in four (4) Critical Capabilities ; and relevant experience in one (1). ZIN's major subcontractor provided very relevant experience in four (4) Critical Capabilities. Its proposal, therefore demonstrated very relevant and relevant experience in all nine (9) Critical Capabilities. The SLPT also assessed the quality of ZIN's performance of these tasks and concluded, based upon the totality of the available past performance data reviewed, that ZIN's performance was predominately excellent, and taking into account a very good safety assessment, it warranted an overall Excellent rating. Based upon this integrated assessment of the recency, relevancy, and quality of ZIN's performance, the SLPT determined that ZIN's performance was of exceptional merit and very highly pertinent to the SEAM acquisition. Thus, the SLPT assigned ZIN a Very High overall level of confidence rating in its ability to perform the required work in support of the FOD. Taking into consideration all of the information provided to me by the SLPT, I understood and accepted its rationale and basis for assigning ZIN an overall confidence rating of Very High. I concurred with this assessment.

I also asked the SLPT to explain its evaluation of ZIN's price, including whether it was fair and reasonable, as well as whether its FBRs were realistic. The SLPT explained that ZIN's final proposed price and FBRs were lower than the average price and FBRs proposed by all Offerors in the Competitive Range, but comparable to the IGCE. I noted that ZIN's total price was the lowest of all the Offerors in Competitive Range. After a review of ZIN's pricing information, including its FBRs, the SLPT concluded that ZIN's price was both reasonable and realistic. I concurred with this assessment.

Selection Decision – Task Category E

I note that the SEAM RFP (Section L.15.1) stated that SEAM is a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract and that NASA anticipates award of multiple contracts under each task category. As such, after an integrated assessment of the Offerors remaining in the competitive range for Task Category E, I must consider whether to make awards to multiple Offerors or select a single awardee.

First, with regard to Bastion, I found that its proposal received the highest possible overall confidence rating (Very High), based upon the depth and breadth of exemplary performance for recent work that was very relevant across the majority of the enumerated Critical Capabilities is value-added. It was significant to me that Bastion demonstrated resident experience across most of the Critical Capabilities for this Task

Category, and in the one Critical Capability (purchasing for projects) where Bastion had proposed a major subcontractor, the major subcontractor possessed very relevant experience. Although Bastion has the highest price of the Offerors in Competitive Range, I determined that the level of very relevant experience justifies the price premium. Moreover, Bastion will be part of the competitive environment in future task orders for this Task Category. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and findings for Bastion, I determine that Bastion's demonstrated past performance at its higher price offers the best value to the Government.

I consider it extremely important for NASA to have multiple providers with fabrication and provisioning experience to maximize the probability that NASA will receive quality fabrication and provisioning services for the FOD fleet in a competitive environment that will result in reduced risk to the Agency and the most cost-effective work for the Government in downstream task orders. In doing so, I considered award of a contract to Rothe and ZIN, the other Offerors within the Competitive Range.

I also found that ZIN's proposal received the highest possible overall confidence rating (Very High), based upon the depth and breadth of exemplary performance for recent work that was very relevant across the majority of the enumerated Critical Capabilities was value-added. ZIN's experience, along with that of its major subcontractor, at the pricing proposed (which was the lowest of the Offerors in the Competitive Range), will help maximize competition on task orders. Therefore, ZIN's demonstrated experience when weighed against its proposed price, also represents the best value to the Agency.

I also found that Rothe's proposal received a High overall confidence rating, based upon its depth and breadth of excellent performance for recent work that ranged from very relevant to relevant to the Critical Capabilities enumerated, by Rothe and its major subcontractors. I noted that with the added experience of its subcontractors, Rothe has the experience to perform the full range of capabilities under this Task Category. Rothe's offered price was lower than Bastion and higher than ZIN. Finally, I note that award of a contract to Rothe will enhance competition in future task orders. I find that Rothe's demonstrated experience, when weighed against the price proposed, also represents the best value to the Agency.

Having Bastion, Rothe, and ZIN as contract holders for Task Category E will ensure that NASA has a deep bench of qualified contractors to provide support in an environment that will engender price competition on such task orders. Thus, I conclude that award to all three is the optimal decision for Task Category E.

In accordance with the RFP requirements and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria as stated earlier, I find that all three companies provide the best value to the Government in the Fabrication and Provisioning Task Category, and I hereby select Bastion Technologies, Inc., Rothe Enterprises, Inc., and ZIN Technologies, Inc. for award of the SEAM contract in Task Category E.

BILLY AUTRY Digitally signed by BILLY AUTRY
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=NASA, ou=People, cn=BILLY AUTRY, 0.9.2342.19200300.100.1.1=bautry
Date: 2016.11.07 17:08:19 -06'00'

11/07/2016

Billy Autry
Source Selection Authority

Date