NAS1-98100

SELECTION **STATEMENT**

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION & MEASUREMENT SUPPORT *(RIMS)* PROCUREMENT

On February **26,** 1998, I, along with certain Langley Research Center (LaRC) officials who have responsibilities related to this procurement, met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide Research Instrumentation **and** Measurement Support (RIMS) services for LaRC. The SEB's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures, and the evaluation findings.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The RIMS contract will provide services in the areas of data acquisition system development and instrumentation engineering; research instrumentation calibration, maintenance and repair; and digital systems maintenance and repair. This support is currently being provided by Wyle Laboratories under Contract NAS 1-19722 for Instrument Support Services and to a lesser extent by Calspan Corporation under Contract NAS1-19385 for services to the LaRC National Transonic Facility (NTF). While the **RIMS** Contract is scheduled to start **on** April 1, 1998, the NTF work **is** planned to be phased into the RIMS contract June 1, 1999.

A cost-plus-award-fee, performance-based contract has been determined to be the most appropriate type for this procurement. The contract will have a one-year initial period of performance with **4** one-year option periods, for a total potential period of performance of five years.

SOURCES

A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on the internet on the **NASA** Langley Procurement Home Page on October 2, 1997. Representatives from 17 firms attended a presolicitation conference held at LaRC on October 9, 1997. The RIMS RFP was issued on the internet November **5**, 1997. Proposals were submitted on or before January **5**, 1998, by the following three firms:

- Calspan Corporation
- ManTech Engineering Services Corporation
- Wyle Laboratories

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, I appointed an SEB to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The SEB 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 and Relevant Experience and Past Performance. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

- Mission Suitability
- cost
- Relevant Experience and Past Performance

The Mission Suitability Subfactors and the weights assigned are **as** follows:

Subfactors		Weights
1. Understanding the Requirements and Approach:		**8**0%
2. Management Approach:		20%
		100%
3. Cost Realism	up to	**-10%**

While the numerical weights assigned to the above subfactors were indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas, they were to be used only as a guide in making my selection decision. The RFP stated that in the overall selection of a contractor for contract award, Mission Suitability, Cost, and Relevant Experience and Past Performance would be of essentially equal importance.

Technical Consultants were appointed to review various portions of the technical proposals (Factor I - Mission Suitability). These consultants provided written evaluations of the proposals in accordance with the evaluation plan and met with the **SEB** to elaborate on their evaluations. **A** Cost/Price Analyst from the Office of Procurement was similarly utilized for Factor ***2,*** Cost.

Upon receipt of proposals the SEB reviewed all offers to determine if any were patently unacceptable. All three were found to be acceptable by the SEB. Each voting member then independently evaluated the Technical Proposals in alphabetical order, noting strong and weak points and assigning adjective ratings to each Mission Suitability Subfactor except Subfactor **3,** Cost Realism. Subfactor **3** could not be evaluated until the probable cost assessment was completed, since the formula for making Cost Realism adjustments is a function of that assessment. After each voting member had individually assessed the strengths and weaknesses of Subfactors 1 and **2,** the SEB developed consensus strong and

weak points and consensus adjective ratings for these Subfactors. The **SEB** then scored each Technical Proposal in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

Thereafter, the SEB assessed the Business Proposals to evaluate the proposed costs **and** relevant experience and past performance (REPP), and to make cost realism adjustments. Consensus adjective ratings were developed for each offeror under Factor **3,** REPP, in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

The initial evaluation findings were then summarized in a report and presented to the Contracting Officer and other cognizant ex-officio members of the SEB on February 19, 1998. The Contracting Officer, in conjunction with the **SEB,** determined that discussions would not be necessary in order for the Source Selection Authority to make a selection. In accordance with the evaluation plan, the SEB then provided me with a written and oral report of their findings.

I have carefully reviewed the facts presented in the report and discussed with the **SEB** the technical merits and comparative strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. The evaluation findings are summarized below.

MISSION SUITABILITY

Set forth below in order of ranking (high to low) is a summary of the major strengths and weaknesses identified for the Mission Suitability factor for the three offerors.

Wyle Laboratories

Wyle received a Mission Suitability rating of Very Good. Wyle demonstrated considerable technical expertise in the representative task areas, having major strengths identified for three of the four representative task orders. Wyle also presented a sound approach to performing the various areas of the statement of work. The proposal included an excellent ISO 9000 compliance plan. The proposed total compensation plan was suitable and had several attractive features. Finally, Wyle received major strengths for the proposed facility, the phase-in plan, training plan, and initial staffing plan. Overall, ten major strengths and no major weaknesses were identified for the Wyle proposal.

Calspan Corporation

Calspan received a Mission Suitability rating of Good. Calspan demonstrated good technical expertise in some portions of the representative task areas, receiving major strengths in three of the representative task orders. However, these strengths were more than offset by major weaknesses for other aspects of the approaches to the representative task orders. The proposal described an innovation for improving reliability and functionality. **A** major strength was also cited for Calspan's phase-in plan. However,

certain features of the total compensation plan were considered weak. Overall, **five** major strengths and nine major weaknesses were identified in Calspan's proposal.

ManTech Engineering Services Corporation

ManTech received a Mission Suitability rating of Fair. Although major strengths were identified for three aspects of the representative task approaches, these were more than offset by major weaknesses identified for other aspects of the approaches to the representative task orders. The ManTech proposal received a major strength for an innovation which was proposed. Weaknesses were identified for the ISO compliance plan and for certain features of the total compensation plan. Overall, four major strengths and seventeen major weaknesses were identified in ManTech's proposal.

Note that it **was** unnecessary to make cost realism adjustments to the Mission Suitability scores for any of the three offerors.

COST

The SEB's cost evaluations were based on the costs and award fee proposed by each offeror for the basic contract period and the four priced option periods. Upward probable cost adjustments were made to all three offerors' proposed prices; however, the ranking of the companies' proposed and probable costs did not change as a result of these adjustments. The ranking (low to high) for both proposed and probable cost is as follows: Wyle, Calspan, and ManTech. The difference between the highest and lowest probable cost was approximately 11 percent.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE AND PAST PERFORMANCE (REPP)

The Wyle team demonstrated a very good overall level of performance and highly relevant experience and received an adjective rating of Very Good.

The Calspan team demonstrated very good to excellent performance and overall very relevant experience and received an adjective rating of Very Good. However, some team members had limited experience in relevant areas.

The ManTech team demonstrated performance ranging from good to excellent on work that was generally relevant to RIMS and received an adjective rating of Good. It was noted that ManTech's experience in wind tunnels was limited. Further, team members' experience was limited in either relevant areas or in scope.

SELECTION DECISION

After the SEB's presentation, I reviewed and assessed the evaluation findings. I noted that the Wyle proposal received the superior rating for Mission Suitability' and that Wyle's proposal had no major weaknesses. I further noted that, in the area of Relevant Experience and Past Performance, Wyle and Calspan were rated evenly, while ManTech received the lowest rating of the three. I then reviewed the comparative position of the proposals from the standpoint of cost based on the Board's assessment. I noted that Wyle had the lowest proposed and probable cost. I also noted that Wyle's proposed and probable costs were lower than the proposed costs of either Calspan or ManTech.

In making my decision, I considered all three factors equally. I concluded that Wyle's superior Mission Suitability score, its Relevant Experience and Past Performance rating, and its lowest proposed and probable costs, resulted in the Wyle proposal being the most advantageous proposal to the Government, all factors considered. Therefore, Wyle Laboratories is selected for the purpose of contract award.

I am convinced that the Source Evaluation Board conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation plan.

Dr. H. Lee Beach, Jr.
Deputy Director, NASA Langley Research Center
Source Selection Authority

3/9/98
Date