

**SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR
FLIGHT SIMULATION SUPPORT SERVICES
(RFP 1-120-1150.3058)**

On December 13, 1994, I met with the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Flight Simulation Support Services procurement. The SEC's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures used, and the results of the evaluation.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to provide flight simulation software and hardware support at LaRC. The Contractor will provide simulation programs representing aircraft and spacecraft being simulated by digital computers and external hardware (cockpits, visual systems, motion systems, and control systems). In addition, the Contractor will perform design, maintenance, modification, calibration and operation of flight simulation equipment. Except for Communication and Data Systems Support, which is now being performed under contract NAS1-20048 by Computer Sciences Corporation, the required services are a continuation of those currently being performed under contract NAS1-19119 entitled Simulation, Communications and Data Systems Support Services.

The proposed contract will be a cost-plus-fixed fee, level-of-effort type. The RFP specified an initial 1-year period of performance commencing on February 1, 1995. There are priced options for four additional 1-year periods, for a total potential period of performance of 5 years. It also includes six 1-month option periods to provide contract coverage for services in the event that award of a follow-on contract is delayed due to circumstances beyond the control of the Government. The RFP included an estimated staffing consisting of 43 man-years of effort for years one through five. The LOE for the six 1-month options will be based on one-twelfth of the annual LOE estimated for the proposed staffing. Additionally, the RFP includes options in each period to increase the LOE to support up to 10 man-years of effort. The place of performance will be on site at NASA LaRC.

SOURCES

The RFP was released on June 13, 1994, to approximately 106 firms. Twenty firms attended the Pre-proposal Conference held at LaRC on July 6, 1994. Proposals were received from the following seven firms.

CTA, Inc., Rockville, MD
 Grumman Technical Services, Inc., Titusville, FL
 Lockheed Engineering & Sciences Co., Houston, TX
 Logicon Technical Services, Inc., San Pedro, CA
 NSI Technology Services Corporation, Fairfax, VA
 SYSCON Services, Inc., Falls Church, VA
 Unisys Corporation, McLean, VA

EVALUATION PROCESS

Prior to issuance of the RFP, the Procurement Officer appointed an SEC to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the solicitation. The Evaluation Plan was approved by the Source Selection Official on June 15, 1994. The RFP and Evaluation Plan specified the following evaluation factors:

- Mission Suitability
- Cost
- Relevant Experience and Past Performance
- Other Considerations

The Mission Suitability subfactors and assigned weights were set forth in the Evaluation Plan and RFP as follows:

| <u>Subfactors</u> | <u>Weight</u> |
|--|---------------|
| a. Organization | 10% |
| b. Phase-in, Staffing, and Continuing Personnel Management | 25% |
| c. Professional Compensation Plan | 15% |
| d. Operations Plan | 30% |
| e. Key Personnel | 20% |

The RFP and the Evaluation Plan stated that the above numerical weights are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas and that the weights would be used as a guide. This plan was followed by the SEC in their evaluation of the proposals received.

The Evaluation Plan and RFP stated that the Mission Suitability subfactors would be scored and that Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations would be evaluated but not scored. In addition, the Evaluation Plan and RFP stated that in the selection of a Contractor for negotiations leading to contract award, Mission Suitability, Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations would be of essentially equal importance; however, within Factor 2, Cost, the costs associated with the options for the additional level-of-effort and the six 1-month option periods may be considered of less significance than the costs for the initial period (including phase-in) and the first through fourth priced options to extend the contract term .

Seven firms submitted timely proposals. The SEC evaluated the proposals in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan, specifically using the standard evaluation procedures set forth in enclosure A of the Plan.

The SEC reviewed each proposal to identify any patently unacceptable proposals. The Contracting Officer was notified that all proposals warranted further review. Each voting member then independently evaluated the Mission Suitability proposals (Volume I) for each offeror in alphabetical order, noting strong/weak points and assigning adjective ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor. Committee consensus strong and weak points and consensus adjective ratings were then developed for each subfactor. The SEC then scored each proposal in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

Business Proposals (Volume II) were subsequently reviewed and analyzed, after which appropriate adjustments were made to the Mission Suitability findings.

The results of the SEC's initial evaluation were presented to the Contracting Officer on October 26, 1994. The SEC, in conjunction with the Contracting Officer, determined that two firms had a reasonable chance of being selected for award and should be included in the Competitive Range. Based on the ratings received by the offerors for the three rated evaluation factors, a preliminary evaluation of proposed costs, and an assessment of the potential for improving the competitive positions of the offerors through discussions, it was determined that the following two firms were in the Competitive Range:

Lockheed Engineering & Sciences Company
Unisys Corporation

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

The SEC then prepared questions for each offeror in the Competitive Range and forwarded them to the firms. Subsequent to the conduct of written discussions with the two 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, and adjustments were made to the initial evaluation findings. The SEC's pricing consultant, in consultation with the SEC, prepared probable cost estimates for the two proposals.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Proposals Not in the Competitive Range

CTA Incorporated (CTA) - CTA had the fifth lowest proposed cost of the seven offerors and their Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Good". CTA's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were rated "Good" and "Very Good", respectively.

Grumman Technical Services, Inc. (Grumman) - Grumman had the highest proposed cost of the seven offerors and their Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Very Good". Grumman's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were rated "Very Good" and "Good", respectively.

Logicon Technical Services, Inc. (Logicon) - Logicon had the lowest proposed cost of the seven offerors and their Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Good". Logicon's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were rated "Excellent" and "Good", respectively.

NSI Technology Services Corporation (NSI) - NSI had the second lowest proposed cost of the seven offerors and their Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Good". NSI's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were both rated "Very Good".

SYSCON Services, Inc. (Syscon) - Syscon had the fourth lowest proposed cost of the seven offerors and their Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Good". Syscon's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were rated "Excellent" and "Very Good", respectively.

Proposals in the Competitive Range

Mission Suitability

Lockheed Engineering & Sciences Company (Lockheed) - Lockheed's proposal received an adjective rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor. Lockheed's numerical score and adjective rating increased as a result of information received via written discussions and BAFO's.

Their proposal contained major strengths in each of the subfactors. Lockheed received a major strength relating to authority and autonomy of a key position. They presented extensive corporate resources for additional support when needed. They proposed a comprehensive recruiting plan for highly-skilled and difficult-to-locate positions. Lockheed proposed an attractive overall wage and fringe benefits package for both professionals and non-professionals. They also received a major strength for certain features of their compensation plan. In the Operation Plan, Lockheed presented an innovative approach to new technology. Lockheed's proposed Contract Manager exceeded all RFP cited education, management and technical minimum experience requirements. The Real-Time Simulation Analysis and Programming Manager exceeded all RFP cited management and technical minimum experience requirements.

Lockheed's proposal also contained five major weaknesses. Two major weakness were given associated with individual aspects of their fringe benefits package for both professional and non-professional employees. The organization plan and method proposed for supporting the major subcontracted area was inadequate. A major weakness was given to the proposed organization structure due to the division of a particular work area and the staff between Lockheed and the major subcontractor, which could result in loss of staff flexibility. A major weakness was assigned to the proposed major subcontractor key person.

Unisys Corporation (Unisys) - Unisys' proposal received an adjective rating of "Excellent" for the Mission Suitability

Factor. Unisys' numerical score increased as a result of information received via written discussions and BAFO's, although the adjective rating remained the same.

Their proposal contained major strengths in each of the subfactors. Unisys received a major strength relating to authority and autonomy of a key position. They presented extensive corporate and subcontract resources for support when needed. Interfacing between Unisys, the Government, and all subcontractors was well thought out and defined. Unisys' phase-in plan afforded maximum contract continuity. Unisys received a major strength for training and career development programs. Unisys has worked out an agreement with their major subcontractor which will insure a smooth salary and fringe benefit transition for incumbent employees who will transfer to the subcontractor. Unisys proposed an attractive overall wage and fringe benefits package for both professionals and non-professionals. Unisys' major subcontractor also received a major strength for certain features of their compensation plan. Unisys presented clear and detailed plans for assigning, prioritizing, supervising, and performing the work areas in the Statement of Work. The proposal demonstrated a comprehensive and thorough understanding of the software requirements in the Statement of Work. Unisys' key personnel meet or exceed all RFP cited education, management and technical minimum experience requirements.

Unisys' proposal contained no major weaknesses.

Cost

The SEC evaluated the realism of proposed costs and the consistency of such proposed costs with other aspects of each proposal. Adjustments were made to the proposed cost for both offerors in the Competitive Range in order to determine the probable cost to the Government.

Of the two firms in the Competitive Range, Unisys proposed the lowest cost. After evaluation of the proposed costs, the SEC determined that the probable cost for each offeror was slightly higher than that proposed, although the relative ranking did not change.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance

Unisys received an "Excellent" rating for the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. Unisys presented experience in all phases of support for real-time man-in-the-loop flight simulation and had a good performance record based on reference checks. Unisys' major subcontractor was also determined to have the desired experience and performance record needed for their proposed task area of work.

Lockheed received a "Very Good" rating for the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. All available information on Lockheed reflected an excellent rating in all phases of support for real-time man-in-the-loop flight simulation. However, since their major subcontractor showed no relevant experience or past performance in the area of work they were proposed to perform, Lockheed was assigned an adjective rating of "Very Good".

Other Considerations

Both Lockheed and Unisys received a "Very Good" rating for the Other Considerations Factor. Both firms were found to be in adequate financial condition to perform the contract, took no exceptions to the contract terms and conditions, and presented a very aggressive approach towards subcontracting to small/small disadvantaged businesses in their Subcontracting Plan.

SELECTION DECISION

After the SEC's presentation, I assessed the evaluation and noted that Unisys's final Mission Suitability and Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings were higher than Lockheed's ratings. I also noted that Unisys' proposed and probable costs were less than Lockheed's.

Finally, I noted that both firms were rated "Very Good" for the Other Considerations factor.

I have concluded that the SEC performed its duties in accordance with the Evaluation Plan. I further conclude that the SEC's evaluation was comprehensive, objective, and fair.

Based on their higher Mission Suitability rating, lower cost,

higher rating in Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and equal rating for the Other Considerations factor, Unisys is selected for the purpose of final negotiations leading to award of the Flight Simulation Support Services contract.

Rosemary C. Froehlich
Rosemary C. Froehlich
Contracting Officer

1-3-95