SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
RANGE OPERATIONS CONTRACT (ROC) II
RFP NNG17611358R

This memorandum sets forth my selection decision for the ROC II procurement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The ROC II requirement was issued as a full and open competitive procurement to acquire Range Operations and related services for the Range and Mission Management Organization (RMMO) at the Wallops Flight Facility. The contractor will provide tracking, telemetry, meteorological, optical, and command and control services for flight vehicles. The flight vehicles include: orbital and suborbital rockets, aircraft, satellites, balloons and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). The contractor will also provide real-time display and capture of mission-specific flight, payload, and science data.

The contractor will utilize on/off-site range engineering and operations services, pursuant to task orders issued by the Contracting Officer. These services shall include the personnel, facilities, and materials (unless otherwise provided by the Government) to accomplish the task orders. In addition, a Top Secret facilities clearance is required for this procurement in accordance with the DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specifications.

The ROC II Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on September 28, 2017. A total of three (3) Amendments to the RFP were released as follows:

Amendment	Issue Date	Description
1	October 17, 2017	Revisions were made to the Mission Suitability Volume Instructions and Evaluation Criteria, Cost Volume Instructions, Enclosure 3: Representative Task Order (RTO) 1, Enclosure 5: RTO 3, and proposal due date.
2	October 25, 2017	Revisions were made to Enclosure 4: RTO 2; and Enclosure 5: RTO 3
3	August 3, 2018	Revisions were made to Enclosure 4: RTO 2; and Enclosure 5: RTO 3. Furthermore, instructions were provided for the Final Proposal Revision

The resultant contract will be a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with an effective ordering period of five (5) years, with no options. The successful Offeror will have a 60-day phase-in period.

This acquisition was conducted as a full and open competition. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 517919 (All Other

Telecommunications) and the small business size standard is $30M. The maximum ordering value inclusive of fee for this procurement is $200M.

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

On November 13, 2017, NASA received three (3) timely proposals from the following companies:

KBRwyle, Inc.
LJT and Associates, Inc.
PAE, Inc.

After initial evaluation of the proposals, the Government established a competitive range, which included all three offerors, and conducted discussions. After discussions were completed, the Government issued Amendment 3, which revised language for RTOs 2 and 3, and requested the submittal of a FPR.

On August 20, 2018, NASA received three (3) timely FPRs from the same companies listed above.

On October 24, 2018, I met with the ROC II SEB, along with several ex-officio members, to hear the SEB's evaluation findings. On November 27, 2018, I selected LJT and Associates for award of the ROC II contract. LJT and Associates was subsequently found ineligible for award. As described in further detail below, I reviewed the SEB's evaluation of the two remaining eligible Offerors for purposes of making a new selection.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The ROC II SEB, appointed by the SSA, included a team of technical and business members and consultants from appropriate disciplines, to assist in proposal evaluations.

The ROC II SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15.3 "Source Selection" and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, NASA Source Evaluations Boards, were applied.

The RFP listed three (3) evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors as follows:

> The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, Mission Suitability Factor is more important than the Cost Factor which is more important than the Past Performance Factor.

The RFP established that only the Mission Suitability Factor would be point scored in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability Factor consisted of the following three subfactors with assigned points as indicated:

SUBFACTOR		POINTS
A	Technical Approach	500
B	Management Approach	400
C	Small Business Utilization	100
	TOTAL	**1000**

The Mission Suitability Factor was evaluated using the adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges found in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The SEB first reviewed each proposal and generated consensus findings (i.e., significant weaknesses, weaknesses, strengths, and significant strengths) within each subfactor. Next, the SEB considered the findings under each subfactor and applied the adjectival rating definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) to assign a rating based on the merit of the proposal within that subfactor. After assigning the adjectival rating for the subfactor, the SEB determined the associated percentile score within the range set forth in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for each subfactor were then multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. For example, if a subfactor has a possible 200 points and receives a percent rating of 80, then the score for that subfactor would be 160 points.

Regarding the Cost Factor, the proposed costs of the Representative Task Orders (RTOs) and the rates proposed in Attachment C, DIRECT LABOR RATES, INDIRECT RATES AND FEE MATRICES, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. As stated in the RFP, the cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). Offerors were referred to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of "cost realism" and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "cost realism analysis" and "probable cost." The proposed costs, including direct labor, other direct costs, and indirect rates, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. Both the "proposed and probable costs" reflected the offeror's proposed fee amount. Proposed fee was not adjusted in the probable cost assessment. The proposed and probable costs were presented to the SSA, along with any issues and risks associated with the proposed costs.

For the Past Performance Factor, the past performance evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15 and provision M.4 of the solicitation. Each offeror's contract references were evaluated to determine the degree of relevance based on size, content, and/or complexity. In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB relied on the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) database, in addition to the narrative on relevant past/current contracts provided by the Offerors. The Past Performance factor was not point scored, but was assigned an adjectival rating of "Very High Level of Confidence", "High Level of Confidence", "Moderate Level of Confidence", "Low Level of Confidence", "Very Low Level of Confidence", or "Neutral."

MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

Mission Suitability has three subfactors as follows: Subfactor A, Technical Approach; Subfactor B, Management Approach; and Subfactor C, Small Business Utilization.

Each subfactor was evaluated in accordance with the weights delineated in the RFP. The table below provides the adjectival ratings assigned in each Mission Suitability Subfactor for the two eligible ROC II proposals.

Offeror	**Subfactor A**	**Subfactor B**	**Subfactor C**	**Total Mission Suitability Points**
KBRwyle	Very Good	Very Good	Excellent	902
PAE	Good	Good	Good	700

The substance of the SEB's evaluation of Mission Suitability for all Offerors is presented below.

<u>KBRwyle</u>

Under Subfactor A, KBRwyle received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" with one (1) Significant Strength, five (5) Strengths, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies.

> KBRwyle received a Significant Strength for their excellent approach to the significant challenge of maintaining and sustaining aging range hardware and software in a restricted budget environment. This integrated and comprehensive approach will benefit the Government by greatly improving efficiency, ensuring equipment availability and significantly reducing downtime. Taken together, the Offeror's proposed maintenance and sustainment approach will greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance.
>
> KBRwyle received five Strengths in the following areas: 1) Several technical enhancements which demonstrate a broad understanding of challenges associated with providing range support, including updates to the Range infrastructure; 2) Requirements management providing detailed and traceable flow from requirements development to requirements implementation; 3) Clearly describing interfaces with NASA organizations, and how they would work as part of the larger Range team; 4) Strong understanding of and approach to complete the Poker Flat Research Range (PFRR) Sounding Rocket mission requirements (RTO 1); and 5) Clear and detailed approach to support RTO 2 which demonstrates a sound understanding of the Mission Graphics upgrade effort. These strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

Under Subfactor B, KBRwyle received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" with one (1) Significant Strength, three (3) Strengths, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies.

KBRwyle received a Significant Strength for their excellent Risk Management Plan which is detailed, comprehensive, and well thought out. KBRwyle demonstrates a thorough understanding of the risk management process and proposes a management board structure chaired by the Program Manager to oversee the process. Their understanding of and approach to risk management significantly increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.

KBRwyle received three Strengths in the following areas: 1) Strong program management plan providing program management tools and a well-organized and efficient management structure; 2) Phase-in Plan that is well-organized, detailed, and tailored to address ROC II phase-in challenges; and 3) Robust approach for acquiring contingency labor that will efficiently respond to workload surges. These Strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

Under Subfactor C, KBRwyle received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" with one (1) Significant Strength, one (1) Strength, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies

KBRwyle received a Significant Strength for their commitment to small business utilization. KBRwyle's Small Business Subcontracting Plan's goals significantly exceed the Contracting Officer's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement and increase the likelihood that KBRwyle will maximize participation of small business and small business subcategories in performing this contract.

KBRwyle received a Strength for their commitment to utilize small businesses in the area of high technology which is one of the stated evaluation criteria in the RFP and aligns with the agency's goal of developing high technology small businesses.

<u>PAE</u>

Under Subfactor A, PAE received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no Significant Strengths, five (5) Strengths, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies.

PAE received five Strengths in the following areas: 1) Several enhancements to the contract that address critical WFF technical challenges; 2) Safety-centered culture and demonstrated commitment to safety that reduces the risk of a safety-related incident during contract performance; 3) Innovative approach and proposed solution that will efficiently respond to operations workload challenges; 4) Technical recommendations for RTO 2 that demonstrate their understanding of the Mission Graphics subsystem upgrade effort; and 5) Detailed approach to scheduling, and asset and resource management. These strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

Under Subfactor B, PAE received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no Significant Strengths, three (3) Strengths, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies.

PAE received three Strengths in the following areas: 1) Process for independent internal review and validation of their ongoing performance; 2) Partnership with a local university

that provides a pipeline of engineering talent for future ROC II staffing; and 3) Clear Risk Management Plan that demonstrates their understanding of the risk management process, and increases the likelihood of successful contract performance. These Strengths enhance the potential for successful contract performance.

Under Subfactor C, PAE received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, no Weaknesses, no Significant Weaknesses, and no Deficiencies

PAE received a Strength for their commitment to utilize small businesses in the area of high technology which is one of the stated evaluation criteria in the RFP and aligns with the agency's goal of developing high technology small businesses.

COST EVALUATION

The SEB evaluated the total proposed cost and determined the Government's probable cost for each proposal. For KBRwyle's proposal, there were no adjustments. For PAE's proposal, the SEB adjusted the escalation for exempt labor categories resulting in a very slight upward adjustment. PAE's proposed/probable costs were significantly lower than KBRwyle's proposed/probable costs of $6,480,460.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In evaluating Past Performance of the Offerors, the SEB found:

KBRwyle was determined to have an Overall Past Performance Level of Confidence Rating of Very High based on the combination of Very High Relevance and Very High Performance.

PAE was determined to have an Overall Past Performance Level of Confidence Rating of Very High based on the combination of Very High Relevance and Very High Performance.

DECISION

I carefully reviewed the SEB's documentation entitled, "Range Operations Contract (ROC) II Presentation to Source Selection Authority" and associated cost reports prior to my initial selection in November 2018 and have done so again in making this selection. I determined that the findings presented by the SEB, as documented in its presentation and the accompanying "ROC II Cost Evaluation – Final Proposal Revisions" reports were detailed and consistent with the evaluation criteria in the ROC II RFP, and provided a clear description of the merits of each proposal. I discussed with the SEB its rationale for the findings and the adjectival ratings and scores for the Mission Suitability Subfactors, and also discussed the rationale for the evaluation of Cost and Past Performance. Further, I solicited the views of ex-officio members in their areas of expertise. I determined that the findings were reasonable and valid for the purpose of making a selection decision.

In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP:

> The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, Mission Suitability Factor is more important than the Cost Factor which is more important than the Past Performance Factor.

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the RFP evaluation factors to determine which proposal represented the best value.

Regarding Mission Suitability overall, I found a discriminator in that the KBRwyle proposal garnered higher ratings than the PAE proposal across all three subfactors. Though the PAE proposal contained multiple strengths, it lacked Significant Strengths, as compared to the KBRwyle proposal, which yielded several Significant Strengths.

Within Mission Suitability Subfactor A, Technical Approach, I noted that KBRwyle received a Significant Strength and multiple Strengths resulting in a Very Good rating. While recognizing the value of PAE's strengths, I observed that the lack of Significant Strengths resulted in a notably less competitive rating of Good. I found that KBRwyle's Significant Strength in the area of maintenance and sustainment of range assets, along with multiple integrated tools and processes, will greatly benefit the Government by improving efficiency, ensuring equipment availability and reducing downtime. Further, I noted that KBRwyle's rigorous maintenance and sustainment approach provides information needed for Wallops Flight Facility government personnel to develop a strategic roadmap for future range upgrades and improvements. By comparison, I noted that although PAE received a Strength in scheduling and asset/resource management, PAE's overall approach to maintenance and sustainment of range assets was less comprehensive with fewer tools and processes than KBRwyle's approach. Therefore, I found KBRwyle's Significant Strength to be a discriminator.

I then turned to the remaining findings under Subfactor A. I observed that KBRwyle and PAE received similar Strengths for a sound understanding of the RTO 2 Mission Graphics upgrade effort, and beneficial enhancements proposed for the range. In comparing the relative benefits of these findings, I found they did not provide a discriminator between the two proposals.

KBRwyle's remaining Strengths for 1) Requirements management, which provides a detailed and traceable flow from requirements development to requirements implementation, 2) Clearly describing interfaces with NASA organizations, and 3) A strong understanding of the Poker Flat Research Range Sounding Rocket Mission requirements (RTO-1), will enhance the potential for successful contract performance. PAE's remaining Strengths for 1) Safety-centered culture and demonstrated commitment to safety that reduces the risk of a safety-related incident during contract performance, and 2) Innovative approach and proposed solution that will efficiently respond to operations workload surges, will also enhance the potential for successful contract performance. I considered the benefits of both sets of strengths and found greater value in KBRwyle's proposal. Specifically, KBRwyle's Strength for RTO-1 stood out as it showed KBRwyle's detailed and sound understanding and approach to support Sounding Rocket missions, providing confidence in KBRwyle's ability to support complex missions. Also,

KBRwyle's proposed requirements management approach demonstrated a solid understanding of the roles, processes, and software necessary to usher requirements through the project lifecycle.

Overall, I found that KBRwyle had a considerable competitive edge over PAE in Subfactor A primarily due to the Significant Strength in maintenance and sustainment of range assets, the approach to requirements management, and the notable Strength in RTO 1 Poker Flats Research Range Sounding Rocket Mission. The condition of the range assets dictates the success and failure of all missions supported by ROC II and sounding rocket missions are an integral part of the Wallops Flight Facility portfolio.

Within Mission Suitability Subfactor B, Management Approach, I again observed that the absence of Significant Strengths in PAE's proposal resulted in a less competitive rating of Good, when compared to KBRwyle's proposal with a rating of Very Good. I found that KBRwyle's Significant Strength for its Risk Management Plan demonstrates a comprehensive and detailed risk management approach and clear understanding of the process, and its application to Range projects and activities significantly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. PAE's Strength in Risk Management Plan demonstrates its understanding of the risk management process and that it can correctly identify risks associated with the Range. In comparing these findings, I found KBRwyle's proposal to be more robust in this area.

I next considered the remaining findings for these two proposals under Subfactor B. I found that KBRwyle's Strength for a robust approach in acquiring contingency labor addresses a more immediate need and provides greater benefit than PAE's more limited Strength for its partnership with a local university. In addition, the broader impact of KBRwyle's Strength for its Program Management Plan outweighs PAE's Strength in the more narrow area of independent internal review and validation. Finally, I noted that KBRwyle received a Strength for its proposed Phase-in Plan which provides a well-organized and detailed description of activities, while PAE did not have a finding in this area. Overall under Subfactor B, I found that KBRwyle had a distinct competitive advantage over PAE due to the Significant Strength for its risk management approach and because its Strengths had a broader impact across the scope of the ROC II work.

Within Mission Suitability Subfactor C, Small Business Utilization, I considered the relative standing of the two proposals. KBRwyle received an Excellent rating based on one Significant Strength and one Strength, and PAE received a Good rating based on one Strength. KBRwyle received a Significant Strength in the area of small business subcontracting by significantly exceeding the Government's subcontracting goals. KBRwyle also received a Strength for small business utilization in the area of high technology. PAE's proposal yielded a strength similar to KBRwyle's for utilization of small businesses in high technology areas, but it lacked a comparable Significant Strength finding, resulting in a considerably less competitive proposal. Therefore, I found KBRwyle had a significant advantage over PAE in this subfactor.

Regarding the Cost Factor, I noted a significant discriminator with PAE offering a significantly lower probable cost than KBRwyle.

In the Past Performance Factor, I noted that KBRwyle and PAE received a Very High level of confidence rating. Therefore, I found there were no discriminators among both Offerors.

Finally, I carefully weighed the evaluation results in relation to the evaluation criteria in the RFP. At the outset, I observed that within Mission Suitability (the most important factor), KBRwyle's proposal offered a significant advantage over PAE's proposal, with each subfactor exceeded by at least one adjectival rating. Next I looked at the second most important factor, Cost. PAE offered a significantly lower probable cost than KBRwyle. In Past Performance, the least important factor, I found no discriminator with the Very High level of confidence ratings received by KBRwyle and PAE.

In making my selection, I again referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP. The lack of discriminators in the Past Performance area, combined with its lesser importance as an evaluation factor led me to focus more on the relative advantages offered by the proposals under Mission Suitability and Cost. I considered the proposals' relative merit under Mission Suitability. KBRwyle's proposal was far stronger, with Significant Strengths in all factors along with notable Strengths of broader impact within Subfactor A and Subfactor B. I also took into account that the Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor. Given Mission Suitability was the more heavily weighted factor, I concluded KBRwyle's advantages under Mission Suitability more than outweighed PAE's much lower probable cost (approximately 23% lower). Specifically, I found that KBRwyle's substantial Mission Suitability advantage, in part due to its Significant Strengths for its outstanding maintenance and sustainment approach, excellent Risk Management Plan, and commitment to exceeding the Government's small business subcontracting goals, outweighs PAE's significantly lower cost. After considering all three evaluation factors, I concluded that KBRwyle offered the best value to the Government.

Therefore, I select KBRwyle for award of the ROC II contract.

Dennis C. Vandertuig
Source Selection Authority

5/31/2019
Date