

18 March 2016

Source Selection Decision Memorandum  
NAVAIR Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division (NAWCWD)  
Test & Evaluation/Training Threat/Target Systems (T4S)  
Solicitation N68936-14-R-0026

From: Source Selection Authority (SSA) for T4S

Subj: NAWCWD T4S Source Selection Decision Memorandum (SSDM)

Ref: (a) Request for Proposal (RFP) N68936-14-R-0026  
(b) Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Report dated 18 March 2016  
(c) D&F #16-117 required per DFARS 215.371-3(a) for single offer procurements

### 1. Description of Acquisition

The Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division (NAWCWD) Combat Environment Simulation Projects (CESP) Branch, Code 539500D, objective is the research, development, delivery, sustainment, and upgrade of threat systems, range instrumentation equipment, range command and control equipment, data routing, storage, and display equipment, and associated software used for pre-deployment aircrew warfighter training and weapons systems test & evaluation (T&E) at Department of Defense (DoD) and Allied training and T&E ranges. NAWCWD is part of an integrated network of established training sites providing the most realistic collective Joint mission experience possible to simulate modern combat environments. NAWCWD is the Design Agent and Technical Lead for the DoD Joint ranges. CESP Branch requirements include three major task areas: Test & Evaluation/Training Threat/Target Systems (T4S), which provides warfighter training and debriefing systems; Aircrew Electronic Warfare Tactical Training Range (AEWTTR), which provides ground electronic warfare (EW) and surface-to-air (SA) weapons threats; and Combat Environment Instrumentation Systems (CEIS), which provides time-space-position information (TSPI) instrumentation and unmanned threats and targets.

The T4S requirement is for a follow-on competitive contract to the existing five-year Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF), Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ), Multiple Award Contract (MAC), which will end in August 2016. This acquisition is to support the T4S requirement, which is one of three task areas under the current MAC, with a competitively awarded CPFF-IDIQ, Single Award Contract.

Industry days were held and a draft of the complete solicitation was issued on 21 September 2015 for industry review and comment. The final solicitation (Ref. a) was issued on 13 November 2015 on the basis of full and open competition best value analysis. Two amendments were issued which provided responses to industry questions, modified Section M to include the definitions of Very Relevant and Somewhat Relevant, provided draft CDRLs, and provided an update to the statement of work. The closing date for receipt of offers was 20 January 2016. The solicitation was open for a total of 68 days.

One offeror submitted a proposal in response to the RFP, reference (a):

1. Jacobs

The proposal was evaluated by the evaluation team in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M of the solicitation. The technical, past performance and cost/price team members evaluated the offer from 26 January 2016 through 18 March 2016 in accordance with the below stated evaluation criteria. Based on the findings noted for all factors, the contracting officer determined that discussions were not required due to the fact that there was only a single offer and any identified inconsistencies did not rise to the level of being a significant weakness or a deficiency. Also, the PCO determined that the price was fair and reasonable and that certified cost or pricing data is not required due to there being a reasonable expectation of competition. The PCO determined that there was a reasonable expectation of competition due to the multiple industry day events and interactions with industry that occurred before the final RFP was released. Also, (b) (5) were in alignment with what has been experienced historically for similar solicited efforts that received multiple offerors. Additionally, (b) (5) under their existing competitive MAC task orders. In accordance with DFARS 215.371-3(a), approval to proceed without the use of certified cost or pricing data has been reviewed and approved at one level above the PCO.

The SSEB's evaluation results (Ref. b) were presented to the Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) on 18 March 2016 where the SSAC provided concurrence to proceed without discussions and award on the initial proposal received.

The SSAC provided me a verbal recommendation to award based on the initial proposals. The recommendation was based on an examination of a complete and thorough evaluation conducted by the SSEB in accordance with the solicitation and documented in an Initial Evaluation SSEB Report, dated 18 March 2016. This source selection decision involves a single offeror; therefore I streamlined the process as allowed by paragraph 3.13 of the Source Selection Plan dated 13 November 2015 with revisions dated 22 December 2015 by waiving the need for a written SSAC Proposal Analysis Report since there is no comparative proposal analysis to provide. I concur with the SSAC's recommendation for the reasons discussed in the paragraphs below.

**2. Section M Evaluation Factors and Evaluation Summaries**

The evaluation criteria set forth in Section M of the solicitation is as follows:

- Factor 1: Technical
- Factor 2: Past Performance
- Factor 3: Cost/Price

Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors

Technical and Past Performance are of equal importance, with each being more important than Cost/Price. All evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

The evaluation team considered the offeror’s ability to meet the RFP requirements and conducted the evaluation in accordance with Section M of the solicitation. A summary of the Offeror’s ratings and risk assessments as noted in the final SSEB report is as follows:

		Jacobs
1	Technical	Acceptable / Low Risk
2	Past Performance	Substantial Confidence
3	Proposed Cost/Price	(b) (5)
	Cost Realism	(b) (5)

**3. Analysis**

I have conducted an independent assessment of the facts, findings, and analyses presented to me, and I have summarized some of the key points of my assessment below. I find the assessments made by the SSEB as detailed in the SSEB report (Ref. b) to be thorough, sound, and well documented.

Technical Compliance: Acceptable. The technical proposal met all technical requirements and presents an adequate approach and understanding of all requirements. Further, no deficiencies or uncertainties were identified.

Technical Risk Rating: Low. The proposal contains (b) (5) (b)(5) in performing the T4S scenarios. Therefore, the proposal is assessed to have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance.

Upon review of the evaluation results, I concur with the SSEB’s rating of Acceptable with Low risk.

Past Performance: I concur with the evaluation team’s assessment of the offeror under this solicitation being assigned a past performance rating of Substantial Confidence based on exceptional performance on very relevant orders. The evaluation details presented in the SSEB report support the conclusion that the Government has a high expectation that the offeror, (b) (5), would successfully perform the required effort.

Cost/Price: Cost realism analysis determined that Jacobs' proposal (b) (5). The (b) (5) are attributed to the offeror's proposed cost for the Scenario (CLIN 0001) where the offeror proposed (b) (5) for the scenario and the Government's Most Probable Cost (MPC) for the scenario was (b) (5). Through further examination of the evaluation as a whole, I concluded that there may be some risk, but it would not be significant and could be overcome during negotiations of future Task Orders and Delivery Orders. More specifically, the reason behind the evaluation team's (b) (5) but due to the fact that the offeror (b) (5). Therefore, the evaluation team (b) (5) the proposed scenario cost and the evaluated scenario cost. There are no other reasons to doubt the offeror's understanding of the work. Additionally, the cost/price was provided for evaluation purposes only because no Task Orders or Delivery Orders will result from this award. All Task Orders or Delivery Orders will be separately negotiated as the need emerges. As such, the cost (b) (5)

Therefore, (b) (5) proposed scenario cost and the evaluated scenario cost did not rise to the level of needing discussions.

Upon review of the facts and findings presented, I agree with the PCO that the requirements of DFARS 215.371-3(a) (Ref. c) has been met such that award can be made in the face of a single offer procurement. I concur that there was a reasonable expectation of competition based on the multiple industry day events and interactions with industry. Furthermore, upon review of the cost/price evaluations of the proposal, the proposed costs and fees were in alignment with what has been experienced historically for similar solicited efforts that received multiple offerors. Additionally, the proposed fee amount for the offeror (b) (5) (b) (5) MAC task orders. This further indicates that the offeror believed a competitive environment existed.

While Jacobs' scenario proposal (CLIN 0001) was (b) (5), I concur with the evaluation team's assessment (b) (5) the Technical Assessment was that the offeror understood the work. I concur that the costs reflect their understanding of the requirements and are consistent with the various elements of the technical proposal. I also conclude that discussions are not necessary in order to address any cost/price variances and that, as a result of the cost/price evaluation, the offeror's cost/price proposal was determined to be fair and reasonable for the work to be performed.

**4. Source Selection Decision**

Based on the facts and assessments discussed above, I conclude that it is in the best interest of the Government to award based on the initial proposals. Therefore I concur with the evaluation team findings and the SSAC's verbal recommendation that Jacobs' proposal provides the greatest overall benefit to the Government, all factors considered, with low risk of unsuccessful contract performance, and I select Jacobs for award of the T4S contract.

(b) (6)

Source Selection Authority