

Source Selection Statement for the Research, Engineering, Mission Integration Services 2 (REMIS2) Contract (Solicitation Number 80JSC023R0002)

On June 14, 2023, the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) was appointed to evaluate proposals for the Research, Engineering, Mission Integration Services (REMIS) 2 Contract, under Solicitation Number 80JSC023R0002. On October 16, 2023, the SEB presented its initial proposal evaluation results to me as the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and other senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The SEB's presentation included a detailed discussion of the evaluation of each offeror's initial proposal. I considered the information presented, requested, and received the opinions of the advisors' present, accepted the findings of the SEB, and concluded the meeting with my selection decision.

Procurement Requirements

The purpose of REMIS2 is to provide spaceflight and ground hardware and software; sustaining engineering functions; engineering services; payload facility integration; and research mission integration and operations services, through contracts with multiple awardees, required by the International Space Station Program. REMIS2 was conducted as a full and open competition with a small business reserve. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 541715 and the small business size standard is 1000 employees.

REMIS2 is anticipated to be a multiple-award Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with the ability to issue Cost-Plus Fixed-Fee and Firm-Fixed-Price TOs. The contract will have a potential ordering period of 9 years from the contract effective date with a 7-year base period and a 2-year option period. Orders placed during the ordering period may require completion up to 24 months after the ordering period expires. REMIS2 may be utilized by other Government organizations, other NASA Centers, and other NASA program offices.

REMIS2 contract is the successor to the current REMIS contract (Solicitation Number NNJ17584385R). The current REMIS contract is a multiple-award contract with Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) and Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) task orders (TOs). The REMIS period of performance had a five (5) year base period and one (1) two (2) year option period with no phase-in.

Chronology

On October 11, 2022, NASA issued a request for information (RFI) / sources sought synopsis 80JSC023REMIS2 on SAM.gov to solicit comments from industry regarding acquisition strategies, request capability statements from interested parties, and request information from industry regarding organizational conflicts of interest (OCI) and diversity, equity, and inclusion. The posting included a REMIS2 Draft Statement of Work (SOW) and a link to the predecessor REMIS RFP for reference and comment.

On November 17, 2022, NASA issued modification 1 to notice 80JSC023REMIS2 to include an announcement for industry day to be held on December 5, 2022, and one-on-ones with industry to be held December 5 and 6.

On December 5 – 6, 2022, NASA held a virtual industry day via Microsoft Teams on December 5, 2022. NASA conducted virtual one-on-one meetings December 5 and 6, 2022.

On February 3, 2023, NASA posted industry charts via modification 2 to notice 80JSC023REMIS2.

On March 3, 2023, NASA posted a Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) via modification 3 to notice 80JSC023REMIS2 to solicit responses from interested parties to be received no later than March 16, 2023.

On March 9, 2023, NASA posted industry day questions and answers via modification 4 to notice 80JSC023REMIS2.

On March 28, 2023, NASA posted the pre-solicitation synopsis number 80JSC023R0002 to SAM.gov. This notice gave an anticipated RFP release date of April 20, 2023, and an anticipated proposal due date of May 19, 2023.

On April 14, 2023, NASA posted final RFP 80JSC023R0002, with an original proposal due date of May 16, 2023. This notice included a question due date of April 26, 2023, and a pre-proposal conference date of April 25, 2023. This notice also included an option past performance volume due date of May 2, 2023.

On April 17, 2023, NASA posted DRFP questions and answers via modification 5 to notice 80JSC023REMIS2.

On April 24, 2023, Modification 1 to Solicitation Announcement 80JSC023R0002 was posted. This modification included RFP Amendment 1, titled 80JSC023R0002P00001, and Model Contract 80JSC023R0002P00001 in the "Attachments" section. RFP Amendment 1 modified the following: 1) Updated the scope of DRD No. REMIS2-PR-02, Total Compensation Plan (TCP) on page J-1-38; 2) Updated the Section B references on page L-30 for Template 3 and Template 5 under Section 4 of L.24.1 COST AND PRICE PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS; and 3) Updated the submission instructions for Attachment L-4 Past Performance Questionnaire template on page L-48.

On April 25, 2023, Preproposal Conferences were held.

On April 26, 2023, Modification 2 to the Solicitation Announcement 80JSC023R0002 was posted. This modification included RFP Amendment 2, titled 80JSC023R0002 Amendment 0002, and the REMIS2 Preproposal Conference slides in the "Attachments" section. Amendment 2 extended the question submittal deadline to April 28, 2023, and extended the proposal due date to May 23, 2023, at 1:30PM Central Standard Time.

The optional deadline for past performance was May 2, 2023.

On May 10, 2023, Modification 3 to the Solicitation Announcement 80JSC023R0002 was posted, notifying industry that the following changes were made: RFP Amendment 3 titled 80JSC023R0002 Amendment 0003, 80JSC023R0002 MODEL CONTRACT Amendment 3, Attachment L-5 Cost Price Summary Template Amendment 3, Attachment L-8 Prime and Subcontractor Identification and SOW Division of Work Listing Amendment 3, and the REMIS2 RFP Questions and Answers were posted in the "Attachments" section. Amendment 3 updated DRD No. REMIS2-PM-01, DRD No. REMIS2-PR-02, and DRD REMIS2-PM-05. This amendment also updated the Template 2 information within Section 4: Workbooks of Provision L.24 and updated Provision L.25 to correct a FAR reference and remove subcontract value from the information required in Attachment L-8, corrected the numbering in cell A1 of Attachment L-8, and updated the Fringe Benefit Analysis of Compensation Plan (FBAC) within Attachment L-5.

On May 18, 2023, Modification 4 to the Solicitation Announcement 80JSC023R0002 was posted, notifying industry that RFP Amendment 4 titled 80JSC023R0002 Amendment 0004 and REMIS2 RFP Questions and Answers 2 are posted in in the "Attachments" section. Amendment 4 extended the Proposal Due date to May 26, 2023, at 1:30PM Central Standard Time, and updated the format requirements for attachments in Provision L.19 Table L-2

On May 23, 2023, Modification 5 to the Solicitation Announcement 80JSC023R0002 was posted, notifying industry that the following changes were made: RFP Amendment 5 and an associated updated model contract were posted in in the "Attachments" section. Amendment 5 updated clause I.1, LISTING OF CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE, to add a fill-in block under FAR Clause 52.219-4

As of the deadline of May 26, 2023, at 1:30 PM Central Standard Time, seventeen offers were received. The following offerors submitted proposals in response to the REMIS2 RFP, 80JSC023R0002 (in alphabetical order):

- Aegis Aerospace
- Axient, LLC
- Cimarron Software Services, Inc.
- Consolidated Safety Services, Inc. (CSS)
- Craig Technologies
- JES Tech
- KBRwyle Services, LLC
- Leidos, Inc.
- METIS Technology Solutions, Inc.
- Oceaneering International, Inc.
- Sierra Space Corporation
- Techshot, Inc.
- Tec-Masters, Inc.
- Teledyne Brown Engineering, Inc.
- The Regents of the University of Colorado (BioServe)
- University of Alabama at Birmingham
- ZIN Technologies

Between May 30, 2023 – June 1, 2023, the CO and Recorder performed initial proposal check-ins in accordance with RFP provision M.2, Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award, and NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Supplement (NFS) subsection 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. The Sierra Space Corporation and BioServe proposals were determined to be unacceptable in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70. In accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals, and solicitation provision M.2, Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award, the Sierra Space Corporation and BioServe proposals were notified and eliminated from further evaluation.

On June 1, 2023, the REMIS2 SEB determined the order of evaluation in accordance with the evaluation plan in the solicitation. The order in which the offerors were evaluated is shown below:

1. Techshot (LB)
2. CSS (SDB)
3. Leidos (LB)
4. Metis (WOSB)
5. Oceaneering (LB)
6. Tec-Masters (HUB, SDB)
7. KBRwyle (LB)
8. ZIN (SDB)
9. Axient (LB)
10. Cimarron (WOSB)
11. Aegis (SB)
12. Craig (SDB/WOSB/SDVOSB)
13. JESTech (WOSB, SDB)
14. Teledyne Brown (LB)
15. University of Alabama Birmingham (Non-profit, other than small)

On July 24, 2023, Amendment 6 of the RFP was issued to the fifteen remaining offerors to update Section I.1, LISTING OF CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE, to add FAR Clause 52.204-27 PROHIBITION ON A BYTEDANCE COVERED APPLICATION. Offerors were instructed to submit a signed copy of this amendment via email no later than 08/01/2023 at 1:30 p.m. Central Standard Time. All remaining offerors except Craig Technologies returned this amendment.

Evaluation Process and Criteria

The proposals were evaluated in strict accordance with the FAR Part 15, NFS Part 1815, and the REMIS2 RFP. The RFP details the SEB Evaluation factors and criteria contained in Section M of the RFP. The SEB carried out the evaluation activities and reported its findings to the SSA, who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

As stated in RFP provision M.2, Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award, “The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offerors whose proposals represent the best value to the Government.”

This source evaluation was conducted utilizing a combination of Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price evaluation factors. Provision M.2 states the following regarding the relative importance of these evaluation factors:

“The Cost/Price factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability factor and Past Performance factor.

As individual factors, the Past Performance factor is approximately equal to the Mission Suitability factor. Individually, both the Past Performance factor and the Mission Suitability factor are more important than the Cost/Price factor.”

Mission Suitability Factor

The SEB evaluated each Offeror’s proposal in accordance with RFP provision M.3, which reflects the Mission Suitability factor is comprised of three subfactors, weighted as follows, for a total of 1,000 points:

SUBFACTOR	WEIGHT
Management Approach	400 points
Technical Approach	400 points
Small Business Participation	200 points
TOTAL	1,000 points

In accordance with the REMIS2 Evaluation Plan and the evaluation criteria set forth in RFP provision M.3, Mission Suitability Factor – Volume I, the SEB carefully reviewed each offeror’s proposal, identifying as applicable: significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies, as documented in its initial findings. The SEB voting members collectively developed a consensus adjectival rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3) (see table below) for each of the subfactors based on the identified significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and/or deficiencies.

NFS 1815.305(a)(3) gives the following adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges for mission suitability subfactors:

Adjectival Rating	Definition	Percentile Range
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror’s response.	51-70

Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

Following the assignment of a consensus adjectival rating for each offeror's proposal under each Mission Suitability subfactor, the SEB voting members collectively developed a consensus percentile rating that corresponded with the assigned adjectival rating. Once the percentile rating was established, the numerical score for that subfactor was computed by taking the consensus percentile rating for that subfactor and multiplying it by the maximum points available for that subfactor. This represented the numerical score for a given subfactor. The final point value for the Mission Suitability factor was then calculated as the sum of the three subfactors' point values. Also, while offerors' proposals received an overall point score for the Mission Suitability factor, they did not receive an overall Mission Suitability adjectival rating.

Past Performance Factor

In accordance with the REMIS2 Evaluation Plan and the evaluation criteria set forth in RFP provision M.4, JSC Procurement Instruction (JPI) 52.215-115 Past Performance Evaluation (Jul 2022) - Volume II, the SEB carefully reviewed each offeror's past performance information for recency, relevance, and performance. The past performance of a prime or team member was compared to the work proposed to be performed by that prime or team member and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The SEB then assigned a level of confidence rating (Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, or Neutral) to each offeror's overall Past Performance.

Cost/Price Factor

Finally, for the Cost/Price factor, the SEB evaluated the proposed costs/prices via price proposal evaluations for reasonableness and cost realism analysis for cost-plus-fixed-fee rates in accordance with RFP provision M.5 Cost/Price Factor – Volume III.

Evaluation of Proposals

The SEB evaluated each offeror's proposal that was determined to be acceptable in response to the REMIS2 solicitation. The following table depicts a summary of the evaluation results for each offeror's initial proposal against the REMIS2 evaluation factors for award. The offerors are listed in order of evaluation. The offeror's size status and, for small businesses, socioeconomic status are listed in parentheses next to the offeror's name for ease of reference, as the REMIS2 solicitation included a small business reserve.

Table 1:

<u>Offeror</u>	<u>Total Mission Suitability</u>	<u>Past Performance Confidence Rating</u>	<u>Total Contract Cost/ Price Proposed (\$)</u>	<u>Total Contract Probable Cost (\$)</u>
01 Techshot (LB)	482	Moderate	*	*
02 CSS (SDB)	586	Moderate	\$40,172	\$40,403
03 Leidos (LB)	688	Very High	\$38,910	\$38,910
04 Metis (WOSB)	600	Moderate	\$24,587	\$25,051
05 Oceaneering (LB)	682	Very High	\$45,140	\$48,513
06 Tec-Masters (HUB, SDB)	656	High	\$37,852	\$38,428
07 KBRwyle (LB)	662	High	\$45,492	\$45,492
08 ZIN (SDB)	578	Low	*	*
09 Axient (LB)	670	High	\$52,616	\$52,616
10 Cimarron (WOSB)	658	Moderate	\$27,811	\$28,132
11 Aegis (SB)	730	Very High	\$42,345	\$42,345
12 Craig (SDB/WOSB/SDVOSB)	460	Low	*	*
13 JESTech (WOSB, SDB)	616	Moderate	\$46,574	\$46,574
14 Teledyne Brown (LB)	662	High	\$48,877	\$49,384
15 University of Alabama Birmingham (Non-profit, other than small)	528	High	\$17,389	\$27,275

assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A).

Techshot's past performance confidence level was rated as moderate due to the most pertinent contract, the predecessor to REMIS2, having a history of marginal quality and schedule performance.

Cost/Price Factor

Techshot's proposed and probable cost was the highest of the fifteen offerors and was significantly higher than the second-highest proposed and probable costs.

Offeror 2-Consolidated Safety Services (CSS)

Mission Suitability Factor

CSS received an overall mission suitability score of 586. CSS was found to have two strengths and two weaknesses for the Management Approach Subfactor. CSS had no findings for the Technical Approach Subfactor and received a score at the low end of the "good" rating. CSS received an excellent score for the Small Business Utilization subfactor score.

Past Performance Factor

The SEB evaluated the three past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires, safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). CSS' past performance confidence level was rated as moderate.

Cost/Price Factor

CSS's probable cost of \$40,403 is the sixth least expensive of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 3-Leidos

Mission Suitability Factor

Leidos received an overall mission suitability score of 688, the second-highest mission suitability score given. The mission suitability subfactor scores (Management Approach, Technical Approach, Small Business Utilization) were all on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating. Leidos was found to have four strengths under Management Approach, one strength under Technical Approach, and two strengths under Small Business Utilization.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the two past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance

Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Leidos' past performance confidence level was rated as very high.

Cost/Price Factor

Leidos had a proposed and probable cost of \$38,910 that is lower than 2/3 of the offerors.

Offeror 4-Metis

Mission Suitability Factor

Metis' overall mission suitability score was evaluated at 600. Metis's Management Approach Subfactor score was at the highest end of the "good" rating. Metis's technical score was on the lower end of the "fair" rating due to two significant weaknesses and one strength. Metis's small business rating was excellent and was found to have one significant strength

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the five past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Metis' past performance confidence level was rated as moderate.

Cost/Price Factor

Metis's probable cost of \$25,051 is the least expensive of the offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 5-Oceaneering

Mission Suitability Factor

Oceaneering received an overall mission suitability score of 682. The mission suitability subfactor (Management Approach, Technical Approach, Small Business Utilization) scores for Oceaneering were all on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating and each subfactor had one strength finding.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the five past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Oceaneering's past performance confidence level was rated as Very High.

Cost/Price Factor

Oceaneering had the fourth highest probable cost, but the \$48,513 probable cost is deemed reasonable.

Offeror 6-Tec-Masters

Mission Suitability Factor

Tec-Masters received an overall mission suitability score of 656. Tec-Masters' Management Approach Subfactor score was at the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its management proposal. Tec-Masters' Technical Approach Subfactor score was on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating and had two strength findings, and its Small Business Utilization Subfactor score was in the "excellent" rating due to a significant strength finding and is tied for the second highest in this category.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the five past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Tec Masters' past performance confidence level was rated as High.

Cost/Price Factor

Tec-Masters' probable cost of \$38,428 was the fourth lowest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 7-KBRwyle

Mission Suitability Factor

KBR Wyle's overall mission suitability score was 662. KBR Wyle's Management Approach Subfactor score was on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating and had one strength finding. KBR Wyle's Technical Approach Subfactor score was on the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its technical approach. Its Small Business Utilization Subfactor score had one significant strength and was in the excellent adjectival rating tied for the highest.

Past Performance Factor

The SEB evaluated KBR Wyle Services, LLC's (KBR Wyle) past performance narratives including, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), a safety assessment, and conducted phone interviews to develop a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). KBR Wyle's past performance confidence level was rated as High.

Cost/Price Factor

KBRwyle's probable cost of \$45,492 was the seventh highest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 8-ZIN Technologies (ZIN)

Mission Suitability Factor

ZIN received an overall mission suitability score of 578. ZIN's Management Approach Subfactor score was at the highest end of the "good" rating due to two strengths. ZIN's Technical Approach Subfactor and Small Business Utilization Subfactor scores were at the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths and no weaknesses.

Past Performance Factor.

The SEB evaluated two past performance narratives, past performance questionnaires (PPQs), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) reports, a safety review, and conducted two Teams interviews with Contracting Officer Representatives (CORs) to develop a Confidence Rating for ZIN in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). ZIN's past performance confidence level was rated as Low. This is due to ZIN having issues meeting schedule, cost overruns, and poor reporting.

Cost/Price Factor

ZIN's probable cost was the fifth highest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 9-Axient

Mission Suitability Factor

Axient received an overall mission suitability score of 670. Axient's Management Approach Subfactor score was on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating with three strengths. Axient's Technical Approach Subfactor score was on the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found for that subfactor. Its Small Business Utilization Subfactor score was tied for the highest and was in the excellent adjectival rating with one significant strength and one strength.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the three past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Axient's past performance confidence level was rated as High.

Cost/Price Factor

Axient's probable cost of \$52,616 is the second highest of the offerors but deemed reasonable.

Offeror 10-Cimarron

Mission Suitability Factor

Cimarron received an overall mission suitability score of 658. Cimarron's Management Approach Subfactor score was at the highest end of the "good" rating with two strength findings. The Technical Approach Subfactor score was at the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths and no weaknesses found. Cimarron's small business score was excellent with one significant strength

Past Performance Factor

The SEB evaluated one past performance questionnaire (PPQ), two CPARS reports, a safety review, a review of Cimarron's Volume II: Past Performance and conducted one Teams interview with Contracting Officer Representatives (CORs) and three interviews with Subcontract managers to develop a Confidence Rating for Cimarron in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Cimarron's past performance confidence level was rated as Moderate.

Cost/Price Factor

Cimarron's probable cost of \$28,132 was the third lowest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 11-Aegis

Mission Suitability Factor

Aegis received an overall mission suitability score of 730. This was the highest mission suitability score given by the SEB, 42 points above the second-highest mission suitability score. Aegis's Management Approach Subfactor and Technical Approach Subfactor scores were on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating, with three and one strengths, respectively. Aegis's Small Business Utilization subfactor score was in the "excellent" adjectival rating with one significant strength

Past Performance Factor

The SEB evaluated Aegis Aerospace, Inc.'s (Aegis's) past performance narratives, evaluations in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), a safety assessment, and conducted phone interviews to develop a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Aegis' past performance confidence level was rated as Very High.

Cost/Price Factor

Aegis' probable cost of \$42,345 falls in the middle range of the offerors in the competition and was deemed reasonable.

Offeror 12-Craig Technologies (Craig)

Mission Suitability Factor

Craig received an overall mission suitability score of 460, the lowest mission suitability score of the fifteen offerors. Craig's scores for the Management Approach Subfactor and Technical Approach Subfactor were given a "fair" rating, with one strength and one significant weakness in the Management Approach and two significant weaknesses in the Technical Approach. Craig's Small Business Utilization score was in the "good" rating with one strength.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the five past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Craig's past performance confidence level was rated as Low.

Cost/Price Factor

Craig's probable cost was the median of the fifteen offerors and was deemed reasonable.

Offeror 13-JESTech

Mission Suitability Factor

JESTech received an overall mission suitability score of 616. JESTech's Management Approach Subfactor and Small Business Utilization Subfactor scores were on the highest end of the "good" rating, each with one strength. JESTech's Technical Approach Subfactor score was on the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the two past performance narratives, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). JESTech's past performance confidence level was rated as Moderate.

Cost/Price Factor

JESTech's probable cost of \$46,574 was the sixth overall and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 14-Teledyne Brown Engineering

Mission Suitability Factor

Teledyne Brown Engineering received an overall mission suitability score of 662. Teledyne's Management Approach Subfactor score was on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating with one strength identified. Their Technical Approach Subfactor score was on the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found within the technical approach. Teledyne Brown Engineering's Small Business Utilization score was tied for the highest and was in the excellent adjectival rating due to one significant strength and one strength.

Past Performance Factor

The SEB evaluated Teledyne Brown Engineering past performance narratives including; references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), a safety assessment, and conducted phone interviews to develop a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). Teledyne Brown Engineering received a high confidence rating for past performance.

Cost/Price Factor

Teledyne's probable cost of \$49,384 was the third highest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable.

Offeror 15-University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB)

Mission Suitability Factor

UAB received an overall mission suitability score of 528. UAB's Management Approach Subfactor and Technical Approach Subfactor scores were at the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths and no weaknesses found for these subfactors. UAB's small business score was in the middle of the "good" rating with one strength and one weakness.

Past Performance Factor

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated the two past performance narratives plus two related contracts performed by University of Alabama at Birmingham, references in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), safety assessment, and phone interviews in developing a Confidence Rating in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A). UAB received a high confidence rating for the past performance.

Cost/Price Factor

UAB's probable cost of \$27,275 was the second lowest of the fifteen offerors. Overall, the price was deemed to be reasonable.

Comparison of Proposals

As Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal as subfactors, and mission suitability and past performance are both more important than cost/price and significantly more important than cost/price when combined, the CO sorted the Offerors in descending order by past performance confidence rating, followed by mission suitability score, and probable cost to determine if there were any clear delineators between the proposals.

Sorted by Past Performance confidence rating, then Mission Suitability score, then Probable Cost (Table 2):

Offeror	Past Performance Confidence Rating	Total Mission Suitability	Total Contract Cost/ Price Proposed (\$)	Total Contract Probable Cost (\$)
Aegis	Very High	730	\$42,345	\$42,345
Leidos	Very High	688	\$38,910	\$38,910
Oceaneering	Very High	682	\$45,140	\$48,513
Axient	High	670	\$52,616	\$52,616
KBRwyle	High	662	\$45,492	\$45,492
Teledyne Brown	High	662	\$48,877	\$49,384
Tec-Masters	High	656	\$37,852	\$38,428
University of Alabama Birmingham	High	528	\$17,389	\$27,275

Contracting Officer determined that discussions were not necessary for this procurement. After careful consideration of the SEB presentation, feedback provided to me by the advisors and my independent assessment of the proposals based on the evaluation factors in the solicitation for Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price, I concur in the Contracting Officer determination that discussions were not warranted for this procurement.

On October 16, 2023, I met with the SEB to review findings and engaged the SEB in a detailed discussion of the material reviewed and presented. I commended the SEB on their thorough evaluation of the proposals. I requested and received the opinions of the senior advisors' present; asked for any comments or concerns with the material presented during the meeting. I then accepted the SEB's findings and determinations and incorporate them by reference in my decision.

Prior to the meeting, I carefully examined the SEB's findings describing the Mission Suitability findings, together with the analysis of past performance evaluations and cost/price. I reviewed the SEB's evaluation of each factor and considered the evaluations of each of the proposals. I found that the evaluation and findings are in accordance with the RFP and its evaluation criteria. I recognize the fact that it is my responsibility to make an independent judgment of the SEB's evaluation results and determine if I agree with the evaluation.

The SEB did an excellent job documenting their evaluation by identifying and explaining the rationale for the findings of the strengths and weaknesses, past performance evaluations, and cost/price. The SEB provided detailed answers to the questions I had during the meeting. As Source Selection Official, I understand the merits, technical and otherwise, and the qualitative aspects of each proposal.

NASA will utilize this REMIS2 contract to obtain services and deliverables via Task Orders (TOs) that will be competed between multiple contract awardees using their commercial approaches to satisfy the REMIS2 SOW. I consider it extremely important for NASA to have multiple providers to compete for the TOs under this contract. After carefully reviewing the initial evaluation results for the fifteen offerors' with acceptable proposals under the REMIS2 solicitation's evaluation factors for award, I considered award for all of the Offerors under the REMIS2 contract. As Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal as subfactors, and mission suitability and past performance are both more important than cost/price and significantly more important than cost/price when combined, I will make my decision on each Offeror as listed above in Table 2 that was compiled by the CO in descending order by past performance confidence rating, followed by mission suitability score and probable cost.

First, with regard to Aegis, I note that its proposal received a very high confidence rating for past performance, and the highest overall mission suitability score given by the SEB. I find considerable value in the Offeror's proposed Risk Management Tool that will track risks across multiple task orders and its proposed portal that will provide up to date performance and management information under its Management Approach and working closely with the Principal Investigator team to set expectations under its Technical Approach. Aegis's management and technical subfactor scores were on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating, and its small business subfactor score was in the "excellent" adjectival rating by being a

woman-owned small business serving as a mentor in the NASA mentor-protégé program. Its probable cost falls in the middle range of the offerors in the competition and has been deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Aegis, I find that Aegis' proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Leidos has a very high confidence rating for past performance and the second highest overall mission suitability score given by the SEB. I find value in Leidos proposed resource loaded schedule to support TO proposals and provision of up-to-date performance and management information under its Management Approach and identification of small and large NASA business partners with complementary and overlapping capabilities to their own as a part of their Small Business Utilization plan. Leidos was rated as "good" across the board in adjectival ratings for each mission suitability subfactor with a reasonable probable cost. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Leidos, I find that Leidos' proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Oceaneering has a very high confidence rating for past performance and the third highest mission suitability score given by the SEB. I find value in Leidos proposed resource loaded schedule in its Management Approach, preliminary hazard assessment in the TO plan in its Technical Approach. Oceaneering was rated as "good" across the board in adjectival ratings for each mission suitability subfactor with a reasonable probable cost. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Oceaneering, I find that Oceaneering's proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Axient has a high confidence rating for past performance and the fourth highest mission suitability score. I find value in Axient's proposed resource loaded schedule, pool of staff Subject Matter Experts, and integrated schedule to provide up-to date performance information under its Management Approach. Although there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its technical proposal, its small business score was one of the highest by proposing to execute enforceable relationships with Small Business subcontractors on award. The probable cost was deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Axient, I find that Axient's proposal offers a best value to the Government.

KBRwyle has a high confidence rating for past performance, and the fifth highest of the mission suitability scores. I find value in KBRwyle's proposal to provide up-to-date contract performance and management information in its Management Approach. Although there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its technical proposal, its small business score was tied for the highest by proposing to use and provide oversight for Small Businesses to support High Technology tasks. KBRwyle's probable cost was in the middle range of the Offerors' and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for KBRwyle, I find that KBRwyle's proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Teledyne Brown Engineering has a high confidence rating for past performance and was sixth in mission suitability scores for REMIS2. I find value in Teledyne's proposal to provide up to date documentation, performance, and management information. Although its technical score was on the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its technical proposal, its small business score was tied for the highest by proposing use of established market research and purchasing procedures to identify and use small businesses in "high technology" work, exceed small business goals and being involved in the mentor-protégé program. Teledyne Brown's probable cost was third highest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Teledyne Brown, I find that Teledyne Brown's proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Tec-Masters has a high past performance confidence rating and is in the middle range of the REMIS2 mission suitability scores. Tec-Masters' was in the middle range for the mission suitability scores because there were no strengths or weaknesses found within its management proposal. However, I noted that their technical approach score was on the highest end of the "good" adjectival rating due to their proposed development of Safety Data Packages that will be valid for all launches and having an independent Quality Management Organization. I find value in this element of their proposal. Tec-Masters small business score was tied for the second highest because it is a HUBZone small, disadvantaged business that demonstrates a commitment to prioritize small businesses for work they are unable to do in-house themselves. Tec-Masters' probable cost is the fourth lowest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Tec-Masters, I find that Tec-Masters proposal offers a best value to the Government.

University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) has a high past performance confidence rating but has lowest of the "good" ratings for mission suitability as there were no strengths and no weaknesses found and there was a weakness related to its Small Business Utilization Plan. The SEB advised that, "When proposal evaluation generates no Mission Suitability subfactor findings, it is a proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response, in accordance with the definitions at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The SEB evaluates such situations uniformly, assessing a 51% and the appropriate associated score." UAB's small business score was in the middle of the "good" rating because of its proposed use of a potential high technology small business subcontractor along with the weakness of not adequately addressing some of the minor assurances under FAR 19.704(a), Subcontracting Plan Requirements. I was advised that UAB's one weakness would be easily corrected through clarifications. UAB's probable cost was the second lowest of the fifteen offerors, partially due to the proposal missing some rates that it will not utilize as a non-profit organization. I understand that probable cost adjustments were made, as needed, to account for labor rates that were not proposed on the cost reimbursable portion. Overall, the price was still deemed to be reasonable with the adjustments. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for UAB, I find that UAB's proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Cimarron has a moderate past performance confidence rating and their management approach score was at the highest end of the “good” rating due to their two strengths found in their management approach. I find value in their Quality Department’s independence from the Program Manager and their contract management system that will provide real-time management information. Their technical approach score was at the lowest end of the “good” rating, as there were no strengths and no weaknesses in their proposal. The SEB evaluates such situations uniformly, assessing a 51% and the appropriate associated score. Cimarron’s small business score was excellent based on the Offeror’s proposed approach of using a team comprised of solely small businesses that will provide small businesses opportunities to grow into areas of high technology and strategic partnerships for future activities. Cimarron’s probable cost was the third lowest of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP’s evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Cimarron, I find that Cimarron’s proposal offers a best value to the Government.

JESTech has a moderate past performance confidence rating and their management approach and small business utilization scores were on the highest end of the “good” rating due to its proposed use of a project management portal to assess performance and management information and established process for small business outreach and assistance, formal agreements already in place with small businesses to perform REMIS2 SOW. JESTech’s technical approach score was on the lowest end of the “good” rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses found. The SEB evaluates such situations uniformly, assessing a 51% and the appropriate associated score. JESTech’s probable cost was the sixth in relation to the other Offerors overall and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP’s evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for JESTech, I find that JESTech’s proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Metis has a moderate past performance confidence rating and Metis’s management approach score was at the highest end of the “good” rating due to their proposed development of a resource loaded schedule for TO proposal responses. I recognize that Metis’s technical approach score was on the lower end of the “fair” rating due to its two significant weaknesses and one strength in this area. The weakness noted by the SEB is related to a lack of understanding of NASA roles and the significant weaknesses related to their proposed Mission Integration and Operations (MI&O) approach and Certification of Flight Readiness (CoFR) processes are both things that can be clarified by the Offeror in the TO competition for opportunities under the REMIS2 contract. Of note to me was Metis’s small business utilization rating was excellent based on their proposed partnership with Minority-Serving Institutions to perform high technology tasks on REMIS2 that will help meet NASA’s small business goals. NASA is the only Federal agency with a 1% goal in this area. Metis’s probable cost was the least expensive of the Offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP’s evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Metis, I find that Metis’s proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Consolidated Safety Services (CSS) has a moderate past performance confidence rating and an excellent small business utilization score due to its proposed commitment to identify potential

subcontracting sources and incentivize their employees for identifying other small business partners. I noted that CSS received a technical approach score at the lowest end of the “good” rating as there were no strengths and no weaknesses found, which the SEB evaluates such situations uniformly, assessing a 51% and the appropriate associated score. The management approach score on the lowest end of the “fair” rating is due to two strengths and two weaknesses in this area of the CSS proposal. One of the strengths is consistent with what is found in other Offeror proposals to provide a portal that will provide up-to-date contract performance and management information. The other strength, which stands out to me, is CSS’s proposed embedding of a Science Advisor to work with the Principal Investigator team to develop their experiment requirements that will set expectations for what is feasible and safe on ISS. The CSS weaknesses are related to lack of details provided for formal design or readiness reviews and inconsistent statements regarding Export Control. These areas are important to perform task orders that are to be awarded under the REMIS2 contract. However, these requirements can be addressed in the task order competition to ensure proper handling under the REMIS2 contract. CSS’s probable cost is in the middle range of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP’s evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for CSS, I find that CSS’s proposal offers a best value to the Government.

Techshot has a moderate past performance confidence rating and the second lowest mission suitability score of the fifteen offerors. Techshot’s past performance was moderate on its most pertinent contract, the predecessor to REMIS2, and has a noted history of poor quality that required Government re-work, cost estimating issues and schedule performance. Although Techshot’s mission suitability score included a technical approach score on the higher end of the “good” rating, a “fair” management approach score with a weakness and no strengths, it cannot overcome its “poor” small business score with two deficiencies. The two deficiencies are related to material failures of the proposal to meet the requirements of the RFP for its small business subcontracting plan and its failure to make a commitment to small business as evidenced by a lack of an independent assessment to achieve the proposed overall subcontracting goals and a brief description of established or planned procedures and organizational structure for Small Business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor- Protégé program, counseling, market research and Small Business identification, or relevant purchasing procedures. This represents a material failure of the proposal in response to the RFP requirements that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level and cannot result in an award as discussions will not be held. Techshot’s probable cost is also the highest of the fifteen offerors and significantly higher than the second-highest probable cost. As such, in accordance with the RFP’s evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Techshot with the presence of two deficiencies, I find that I cannot award to Techshot and its proposal does not offer a best value to the Government.

ZIN has a low past performance confidence rating with very relevant past performance references, including on the predecessor contract REMIS. However, ZIN’s past performance on those contracts indicates that, in many instances, problems were identified that had a measurable effect on overall contract performance. This is not the type of performance that is desired for REMIS2. Of note, ZIN was reported to have some issues meeting schedule, cost overruns and

poor reporting, despite repeated government involvement to resolve. ZIN's management score is at the highest end of the "good" rating due to two strengths. ZIN's technical and small business scores were at the lowest end of the "good" rating as there were no strengths or weaknesses. ZIN's probable cost is in the middle range of the Offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for ZIN with the history of past performance issues, I find that I cannot award to ZIN as its proposal does not offer best value to the Government.

Craig has a low past performance rating due to its past performance history being found only somewhat relevant to the REMIS2 requirements despite its quality being very good. Craig was given a fair rating with three significant weaknesses in their mission suitability volume as it relates to its management and technical approaches. This resulted in Craig receiving the lowest mission suitability score of the fifteen offerors. The significant weakness in Craig's management approach is related to Craig's proposed reliance on the recruitment of incumbent employees for REMIS2 TOs as a part of its management approach. However, this is not feasible because REMIS2 TOs do not have existing incumbents to recruit from to perform the REMIS2 SOW. Craig's significant weaknesses in technical approach are related to its proposal's lack of a method to implement a quality assurance program that ensures hardware functions are valid and lack of Certification of Flight Readiness process that would render Craig able to deliver flight hardware. Both of these are important to the performance of REMIS2. Craig's small business utilization score was in the "good" rating with one strength for its proposed performance of at least 50% of the REMIS2 contract. Craig's probable cost was at the median of the fifteen offerors and deemed reasonable. As such, in accordance with the RFP's evaluation scheme, and acknowledging the relative importance of the evaluation criteria and assessments for Craig with low past performance and a fair rating in mission suitability, I find that I cannot award to Craig as its proposal does not offer a best value to the Government.

Conclusion

Based on my assessment of all the relevant Offerors' proposals, it is my decision that having the following Offeror's as REMIS2 contract awardees will ensure that NASA has a deep bench of qualified contractors to provide support on the REMIS2 contract Task Orders:

- Aegis (SB)
- Leidos (LB)
- Oceaneering (LB)
- Axient (LB)
- KBRwyle (LB)
- Teledyne Brown (LB)
- Cimarron (WOSB)
- Tec-Masters (HUB, SDB)
- University of Alabama Birmingham (Non-profit, other than small)
- JESTech (WOSB, SDB)
- Metis (WOSB)
- Consolidated Safety Services (SB)

Thus, I conclude that award to all twelve of the Offerors listed above is the optimal decision for REMIS2 Contract as their proposals represent best value for the Government.

JOEL

MONTALBANO

Digitally signed by JOEL MONTALBANO
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=nasa,
ou=People, cn=JOEL MONTALBANO,
0.9.2342.19200300.100.1.1=jmontalb
Date: 2023.12.18 11:30:45 -06'00'

Joel R. Montalbano
Source Selection Authority