N-91-19370

SELECTION STATEMENT

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR
ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
SUPPORT SERVICES

On December 17, 1991, I, along with certain Center officials who have responsibilities related to this procurement, met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide the Center with support services under the Atmospheric Sciences Research and Technology Support Services Contract. The Board's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures, and the results of the evaluation of the proposals submitted.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The Atmospheric Sciences Research and Technology Support Services Contract will provide support to Langley Research Center's atmospheric sciences research and technology programs. The type of services to be provided are summarized below:

Analytical Studies including scientific support in the development and solution of the governing equations of atmospheric phenomena; analysis and interpretation of atmospheric data; and the mathematical and computational modeling of the atmosphere.

Operational Data Processing and Archiving, including the screening of raw telemetry data from satellites and other research platforms; the combining of this data with that from other sources; the retrieval and validation of atmospheric parameters, and the archiving of final data products in a form accessible to researchers.

Instrumentation Development including the analysis of research objectives and instrumentation concepts for ground, aircraft, and spacecraft; the development and analysis of laser systems, optical systems, sensors, and related data systems; and the sustaining operations associated with the use of the instruments.

Field Studies including logistics, transportation, and operations in support of field experiments in worldwide locations; the maintenance and operation of airborne data acquisition systems; and the monitoring of instrument performance during field operations.

Administrative and Logistical Support including the organization of science team meetings, workshops, and conferences; the provision of facilities, audio visual

equipment, graphics, and meeting documentation; and the arrangement of travel and lodging for non-NASA personnel.

Documentation including the development and maintenance of documentation associated with instruments, operations, data systems, and mathematical models of the atmosphere.

The contract will be a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee type contract with a period of performance of 2 years. The contract will contain a series of 2-year options which can be used to extend the period to a total of 10 years. The contractor will be required to furnish up to 408,750 direct labor hours for the initial contract period and for each of the option periods. The number of direct labor hours may be increased by exercise of options during initial contract period and each of the option periods. The number of additional direct labor hours set forth in these options vary from 202,500 for the initial contract period to 352,500 for the fourth option period.

SOURCES

The Request for Proposal (RFP) was provided to 206 firms. The preproposal conference on April 13, 1990 was attended by 34 firms. Proposals were submitted by the following nine companies:

Bionetics Corporation, Hampton, VA
Lockheed Engineering and Sciences Corporation, Houston, TX
McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company , Seabrook, MD
New Technology, Inc., Huntsville, AL
PRC Inc., McLean, VA
Science Applications International Corporation, McLean, VA
Science Systems and Applications, Inc., Lanham, MD
Science and Technology Corporation, Hampton, VA
ST Systems Corporation, Lanham, MD

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The RFP set forth the following four evaluation factors:

Mission Suitability
Cost
Relevant Experience and Past Performance
Other Considerations

Overall, in the selection of a Contractor for negotiation leading to contract award, Mission Suitability, Costs, and Relevant Experience and Past Performance were of

essentially equal importance. Other Considerations was of less importance than each of the other three factors.

The Mission Suitability subfactors and the weights assigned to each of those subfactors were listed as follows:

Subfactor 1 -	Organization	15%
Subfactor 2 -	Initial Staffing and Phase-in	10%
Subfactor 3 -	Continuing Personnel Management	15%
Subfactor 4 -	Total Compensation Plan	10%
Subfactor 5 -	Work Accomplishment	30%
Subfactor 6 -	Key Personnel	20%

All costs, including those associated with options, were evaluated within the Cost Factor . However, those costs associated with the options for additional level of effort were considered of less significance than the costs of the base requirement for the initial and option periods.

The Other Considerations factor was comprised of the following four subfactors:

Subfactor 1 - Financial Condition and Capability

Subfactor 2 - Subcontracting Plan for Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns

Subfactor 3 - Facility

Subfactor 4 - Contract Terms and Conditions

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the Board developed a detailed evaluation plan, including a numerical and adjectival scoring system for the Mission Suitability subfactors. In addition, the plan stated that the SEB would evaluate but not score Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations, ultimately assigning these factors an adjective rating to reflect the results of that evaluation.

The evaluation was performed by the Board without the use of committees or subcommittees. Consultants were utilized to assist the Board in performing portions of its evaluation. The evaluation process was preceded by a review of the proposals to assure compliance with the page and print limitations set forth in the Request for Proposals. This review resulted in the removal and return of one or more pages to seven (7) of the proposers. The evaluation began with each member individually

reviewing the technical proposals to determine if any should be rejected as patently unacceptable. All nine (9) proposals were found to merit in-depth evaluation.

Each voting member then independently evaluated the Technical/Management proposals in alphabetical order, noting strong and weak points and assigning adjective ratings to each Mission Suitability Subfactor. After each Board member had individually assessed the strengths and weaknesses, the entire SEB held discussions to arrive at a consensus set of strong and weak points. The Board then scored and ranked the proposals.

Thereafter, the Board assessed the proposed costs, relevant experience and past performance, and other considerations as reflected in each proposal. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to the Contracting Officer who, in conjunction with the SEB, determined that three firms had a reasonable chance of being selected for award and should remain in the competitive range. This decision was based on the firms' superior Mission Suitability ratings of "very good"; reasonable costs; Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings of "Excellent"; and Other Considerations of "Excellent " or "Very Good". The three (3) firms in the competitive range were:

Lockheed Engineering and Sciences Corporation
Science Applications International Corporation
ST Systems Corporation

The unsuccessful offerors were informed in writing that their proposals were no longer being considered for contract award.

The Board then formulated questions for each offeror in the competitive range and forwarded them to the firms with letters of invitation for oral discussions. Subsequent to the conduct of written and oral discussions with the three companies, they were requested to submit any revisions to their proposals by a common cut-off date.

The revised proposals were reviewed and evaluated following the same procedures used in the initial evaluation.

EVALUATION RESULTS
Proposals Not In Competitive Range

Bionetics Corporation (Bionetics) The Bionetics proposal was one of the lower cost proposals received. However, the proposal rated near the middle of the "Good" range under the Mission Suitability Factor and its Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor was rated as "Average". Under the Other Considerations Factor, its proposal was considered "Very Good".

McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Company (McDonnell) The McDonnell proposal received ratings of "Excellent" under both the Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors. However, the proposal rated near the middle of the "Good" range under the Mission Suitability Factor and the costs were higher than most other proposals.

New Technology, Inc. (NTI) The NTI proposal had one of the highest probable cost to the Government and its rating under the Mission Suitability Factor was only "Fair". The NTI Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated as "Very Good" while the rating under the Other Considerations Factor was "Average".

PRC Inc. (PRC) The PRC proposal was one of the lower cost proposals and its Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated as "Excellent". The proposal received a rating of "Very Good" under the Other Considerations Factor. However, under the Mission Suitability Factor the PRC proposal was given a rating that was near the bottom of the "Good" range.

Science Systems and Applications, Inc. (SSAI) The SSAI proposal received a rating of "Fair" under the Mission Suitability Factor and its Relevant Experience and Past Performance was considered to be "Marginal". The SSAI proposal was rated "Very Good" under the Other Considerations Factor and the cost of the SSAI proposal was near the mean of all proposals.

Science and Technology Corporation (STC) The STC proposal was one of the lower cost proposals received. However, the proposal rated near the bottom of the "Good" range under the Mission Suitability Factor and its Relevant Experience and Past Performance was rated as "Average". Under the Other Considerations Factor it's proposal was considered "Very Good".

Proposals In Competitive Range

Mission Suitability

Lockheed Engineering and Sciences Corporation (Lockheed)

The proposal submitted by Lockheed received a rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor, but, its numerical score was the lowest of the three proposers in the competitive range. There were adjustments of numerical scores for two of the subfactors as a result of information provided as a part of oral and written discussions. However, there was no change in adjective rating between the initial and final evaluation while the total numerical score declined slightly.

The Lockheed proposal did contain several strengths--particularly in the area of continuing personnel management where its proposal received the highest score. Some of the strengths of the Lockheed proposal are set forth below. Lockheed proposed excellent plans for: accommodating fluctuating workloads; recruitment for specific, hard-to-fill positions; and training, orientation, and career development for all employees. Lockheed also presented an excellent approach to cost control, reporting, and forecasting.

The Lockheed proposal did contain several weaknesses. Under the Key Personnel Subfactor the Lockheed proposal was accorded only a rating of "Fair" because a number of the proposed key personnel lacked the required experience, educational background or both. In evaluating the proposed organization it was found that some of the sections were too large for effective management and that insufficient time was being allocated to supervision.

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

The proposal submitted by SAIC received a rating of "Excellent" for the Mission Suitability Factor. SAIC's numerical score was the highest of all proposers in both the initial and final evaluations. There were adjustments in both the numerical scores and adjective ratings as a result of information provided during oral and written discussions. The numerical score for four of the subfactors were increased and this resulted in the change in the adjective ratings for two of the subfactors. These changes resulted in a change in the overall adjective rating from "Very Good" to "Excellent".

The SAIC proposal contained a number of strong points, some of which are mentioned below, that resulted in the SAIC proposal receiving the highest score for four of the six subfactors. The proposal set forth a comprehensive statement of duties, authorities, and responsibilities of its contract organization and key personnel. SAIC demonstrated that it has excellent policies to attract and retain high caliber employees. SAIC has a strong pension plan. The SAIC proposal demonstrated the presence, and effective use, of procedures for planning, executing, monitoring, cost controlling, and closing out tasks. The proposed key personnel were very well qualified by virtue of education and experience for the positions proposed.

The SAIC proposal did contain a few weak points. The proposal did not provide for sufficient amount of time allocated to supervision.

ST Systems Corporation (STX)

The proposal submitted by STX received a rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor. STX's numerical score was the second highest of all proposers in both the initial and final evaluations.

The STX proposal contained a number of strong points, some of which are mentioned below, that resulted in the STX proposal receiving the highest score for the Initial Staffing and Phase-In Subfactor. As incumbent, the Company has a full complement of staff (100% incumbent retention) and facilities in place to ensure continuity of services. The proposal set forth an effective organizational approach to solving special needs or challenges. Detailed and well-organized recruiting plans were provided for specific, hard-to-fill positions. Sound policies to attract and retain employees were proposed.

The STX proposal did contain several weaknesses. Under the Total Compensation Plan Subfactor the STX proposal presented a pension plan which was considered weak. Although most of the Key Personnel met or exceeded the education and experience requirements, a few of the proposed key personnel did not meet the minimum requirements.

Costs

The Board evaluated the realism of proposed costs and the consistency of such proposed costs with other aspects of the proposal. Adjustments were made to the proposed costs submitted by all three proposers in the competitive range in order to determine the probable cost to the Government of each of the proposals.

Lockheed proposed the lowest cost for the base effort for the total 10-year period and for the optional level of effort. The Costs proposed by SAIC and STX were somewhat higher with the SAIC proposed costs being the highest. After evaluation of the cost proposed by Lockheed the Board found that the probable cost of the Lockheed proposal was greater than that proposed by Lockheed. The Board found that the costs proposed by STX did not warrant any substantial adjustment. In evaluating the SAIC proposal the Board found that the probable cost to the Government was less than that proposed by SAIC. The Board found that the SAIC proposal had the lowest probable cost for the base effort and for the maximum effort available through exercise of all the options. The difference in probable costs from lowest to highest was approximately 4 percent for the maximum effort.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance

Lockheed, SAIC and STX all received a rating of "Excellent" under the Relevant Experience and Past Performance factor. All three proposals reflected extensive experience in performing similar work. Further, references checks confirmed that all three have histories of high quality performance.

Other Considerations

The Lockheed proposal received a rating of "Excellent" under the Other Considerations factor. The SAIC and STX proposal received a rating of "Very Good" for that factor. All three proposals demonstrated strong financial condition and capability. All three proposed suitable facilities and none took exceptions to the proposed contract terms and conditions. The SAIC and STX presented adequate subcontracting plans. Lockheed proposed an excellent subcontracting plan.

SELECTION DECISION

Subsequent to the Board's presentation, I met in executive session with a small group of Center officials who have responsibilities related to this procurement. They had also heard the presentation and read the Board's report. Their comments and observations were solicited during the course of our discussion.

We reviewed and assessed the Mission Suitability evaluation and noted that SAIC had submitted a proposal superior to those submitted by the other two firms in the competitive range. It was recognized that the differences were significant and that the differences were accurately reflected in the score differences that were close to ten (10) percent.

We then reviewed the Board's assessment of Relevant Experience and Past Performance and noted that all three firms were rated equal. The Other Considerations factors evaluation indicated that the Lockheed proposal was considered superior because of the excellent subcontracting plan and that the proposals were equal in regard to all the other subfactors.

Finally, we discussed the comparative position of the three proposals in the competitive range from the standpoint of cost based on the Board's probable cost assessment. We noted that SAIC's costs were the lowest for the base requirement and maximum contract effort by a relatively small margin.

I have concluded that the Source Evaluation Board performed its duties in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in NASA Handbook 5103.6B. I further conclude that the Board's evaluation was objective and fair.

Based on its superior mission suitability proposal accompanied by the lowest probable costs, Science Applications International Corporation is selected for the

purpose of final negotiations leading to award of the Atmospheric Sciences Research and Technology Support Services Contract .

Paul F. Holloway
Director

7/12/92
Date